This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UC-NRLF
$B 293 800

75
Prophecies
F.

REESE LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
Received May 1884
Accessions No. 25111 Shelf No.

A

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION

OF THE

PROPHECIES OF DANIEL.

BY

NATHANIEL S. FOLSOM.

REESE LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA.

BOSTON:
CROCKER & BREWSTER.
NEW YORK: DAYTON AND NEWMAN.—ANDOVER: ALLEN, MORRILL AND WARDWELL.
1842.

BS1556
T6

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842, by
NATHANIEL S. FOLSOM,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

25112

ANDOVER:
Allen, Morrill & Wardwell, Printers.

PREFACE.

THE following work contains not a commentary on the entire Book of Daniel, but an interpretation of the prophetic parts found in chapters ii, vii, viii, ix, xi, xii, with particular regard to those passages which are supposed by many to predict the personal advent of our Savior A. D. 1843. There are also prophecies in chapters iv, v, pertaining to the kings of Babylon alone, but they need no explanation. The narrative portions which occupy the remainder of the Book, require little or no aid to be readily understood; and what difficulties exist in them, will generally be found solved in those allusions to the narrative parts, which an interpretation of the prophetic has made necessary.

It may appear to some a foolish and to others an unnecessary matter, to notice what is technically called "Millerism;" for the time is at hand which will effectually test its truth or its falsehood. But surely no Christian, no serious man should look on with indifference, when any portion of the popular mind is agitated throughout, and swells and heaves tumultuously, to create what evil it may, and then die away as it may. The admonition given of old, "Refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this work be of men, it will come to nought,"—is of value so far as the duty to refrain from acts of violence is concerned, but ill applies to the discussion of any truth, or the arrest of any evil. Not a few have adopted Mr. Miller's views who are sober-minded and discerning on every other subject, and many more are searching the Scriptures to see whether these things are so, and they ask for light. They have not been accustomed to study the prophecies, and they see not why A. D.

1843 may not be the date as well as 1866, etc. which have been fixed on by others. They also feel that one great element of truth is in the doctrine of the second advent, as advocated by Mr. Miller—

> "The Lord will come! but not the same
> As once in lowly form he came,
> A silent lamb to slaughter led,
> The bruised, the suffering and the dead.
>
> The Lord will come! a dreadful form
> With wreath of flame, and robe of storm,
> On cherub wings, and wings of wind,
> Anointed Judge of human kind."

To this truth Mr. Miller owes the greater part of his success. Possibly also this element of truth has not received the attention in modern preaching it did in the primitive age, and it comes to the people now as something comparatively new to them. For *inquirers* on this subject, it will not be a thankless or useless task to have written.

Only small portions, however, of this work will be found devoted to the modern doctrines of the personal advent of our Lord, A. D. 1843. What is said, is said plainly, and he who runs may read that whatever else may be derived from Daniel, the doctrines above mentioned cannot. Whoever wishes to turn to those portions at once will find them chiefly on pages 29, 30, 42—44, 72, 73, 78—80, 84, 85, 140, 160, 161, 166, 167, 173, 212—215, 229. The general scope of the Interpretation will throw more light than any particular parts of it. But the prophecies of Daniel contain vastly more than can be interesting only to those who wish to see it satisfactorily shown that he does not predict the end of the world, A. D. 1843. The study of them makes it necessary to introduce much historical matter of great practical value and of the deepest interest. A higher end still, and one which it is the object of this Interpretation to promote more than any other, is the impression which

these prophecies make, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, who should come into the world—an impression which the writer has himself experienced more deeply than before, unless he is deceived, and which he would impart to others. Prophecy and miracle have not yet done all they were designed to do, and can do, in working with the teachings of our Lord and his apostles to produce a tranquil, firm faith, and a righteous life.

The order of study pursued has been from the more full, and expanded, and clear prophecies to the more brief, and comprehensive and difficult. It is obvious on a general perusal, and it is acknowledged by all who have studied these prophecies, that the general scope of each prophecy or vision is the same, or that they all tend to the same events. It would appear therefore most proper to investigate the latter prophecies first, and especially chap. xi. The prophecy next in clearness is chap. viii, and no one disputes that it is entirely parallel with chap. xi. Having studied and closely ascertained the meaning of these two chapters, the next in order is seen at once to be chap. vii, which is parallel with chap. viii, through the series of kingdoms as far as to the announcement of a new one to be set up by the God of heaven, which seems to be its own unfolding; and parallel entirely with chap. vii, is chap. ii, at least in its events, though different in description. From these the way is open to chaps. ix. and xii, which contain the remainder of the prophetic portions. The appearance of order in Commentary, beginning with the first of the book to be interpreted and proceeding through to the last, has been sacrificed to what has been judged to be at least in this instance the true and philosophical mode of investigation. The path by which the author has reached his results, is one by which he has chosen to lead others.

Those familiar with the history of Commentary, will see that the general current of interpretation, which designates the fourth kingdom as the Roman, has not been pursued. The author must refer for all his reasons to his book, and would only here say

that he could not find the Roman kingdom, except incidentally, in chap. xi, which is parallel with chap. viii, and with the first part of the prophecies in chapters ii, vii. But in his interpretation, though he came to it unaided by what others had said, he finds himself sustained by some who have written on the subject with much ability, as for instance in the Christian Review, March Number, for this present year. The continuance of the opinion that the fourth kingdom is the Roman, is humbly conceived to be the use it has served in the controversy of Protestants with Roman Catholics, and the influence of great names like Sir Isaac Newton, and perhaps the manner in which so good a man as Bishop Newton has spoken of those who have embraced the opposite opinion, as being only influenced by a "fondness of disputing about the plainest points," and as maintaining the "strange wild conceit of Grotius," or taking part with the infidel Porphyry. There is also the coincidence between the language of Daniel on the fourth kingdom, and of John on persecutions after Christ; which has seemed to identify them. But most certainly many events different in the New Testament from the Old, are yet described in the same language. And it is natural that great oppressors and persecutors, who must in so many general points resemble each other, should be described in nearly the same language. Great bad men are much alike, and hence so many very diverse applications of the prophecies. But the prophecies cannot describe all the great bad men in the world, all the persecutors of the saints. The *context* must guide to the particular individuals designated; and the context of Daniel by its specifications and dates, shows that he had *particular* individuals in view, and not a class. It is the aim of this Interpretation, scrupulously and faithfully to obey this guide.

It remains to make a few remarks on the Book of Daniel itself. The history of the holy man whose name it bears, is given

so fully in connexion with his prophecies, as to need no notice here. He uttered his first prophecy soon after he was introduced to the court of the king, and when he could not have been more than twenty-three or four years of age. His first vision was revealed to him forty-eight years after his first prophecy; his final vision, in the third year of Cyrus—which must have been near the close of his life, for he was then at least ninety or ninety-five years of age, and we hear no more of him afterward.

The Book bears throughout the impression of one and the same hand. The chief appearance of diversity is that from verse fourth of chapter second to the end of chapter seventh, it is written in the Chaldee language, but the remainder is in Hebrew. This is a peculiarity worthy to be noticed, but it affects not the question whether the whole is the work of one individual, if that individual understood both languages—and there cannot be a doubt that Daniel understood them both. Why he thus wrote, it may now be impossible to be ascertained; only conjecture can supply the reasons. All that is written in Chaldee, related particularly to the Chaldean kings or people, except chapter second in part, and also chapter seventh in part. It was fit that the Chaldeans should have these events, and also the whole of the vision of the series of kingdoms, in their own native language. There were great objects to be gained by the influence which Daniel should exert over the nation that conquered his people; and we can see from the period of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and onward, how a divine Providence ordered all things so that Daniel might throw his protection over his countrymen, meliorate their captivity, and perhaps secure the decree for their restoration. The existence of these records in the Chaldee language, would of course further this influence, and in this is an adequate reason for a part of these prophecies being found in that language. Perhaps, too, as the Hebrew language became at that time greatly corrupted, many of his countrymen born in Chaldea would understand the Chaldee better than the Hebrew.

That these prophecies were veritable prophecies of Daniel, whose name they bear, we have the surest grounds for believing. Whatever apparent difficulties may be presented, there is the authority of him who referred his disciples to "Daniel the prophet," Matt. 24: 15, Mark 13: 14, under circumstances too serious to admit of any doubt that he spake from his own knowledge and faith. It seems idle to say, as does Rosenmüller, that our Savior spake only according to the received opinion of his cotemporaries. What purpose would he gain by it? Why not place the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem on his own sole authority, if there had been no prediction uttered by a prophet of old? What more difficulty is there in believing that even our Lord uttered a prediction of the future destruction of Jerusalem, than that Daniel did? Why must not both be cast aside, if either?

There is also the testimony of Josephus, B. x. c. 11. sec. 7, which will be found in the Interpretation. Some among the later Jews have been disposed to set Daniel aside, but there is no existence of a doubt up to the Christian era.

The internal evidence is itself strong, as even those acknowledge, who deny that Daniel was the author. Says one of this class, Rosenmüller, "There is nothing to be found in the book which might not come properly from Daniel; since he was born a Hebrew, educated at the court in Babylon, imbued with the learning of the Chaldeans and of the Magi, and especially skilled in interpreting dreams; so that there seems to be scarcely a reason why we should doubt he was the author of the book." But then say those who doubt the genuineness of the book, there are the strange events mentioned, such as his being cast into the lion's den, etc., and there is the wonderful particularity of events in the closing vision. But if the book is to be regarded as not genuine because of the miraculous events, what book in the Scriptures will stand? There were final causes in the Captivity and the Restoration worthy of this miraculous interposition; and a miracle in any age like that of being un-

harmed in a lion's den, or thrown into a seven times heated furnace, and coming forth without a touch or smell of fire on the garments, is not greater than prophecy. In regard to the particularity of events, it is indeed wonderful, and it is well known that Porphyry, an ancient opposer of the Bible and Christianity, argued on that account that Daniel's prophecies must have been written *after* the events, and they were to be found too all recorded in history.* But the particularity of the prophecies of Daniel is not more remarkable than some of the prophecies of our Savior, and nothing but denial without the shadow of a substantial *proof* is brought against either.

The voice which itself speaks from these very prophecies is louder than any external proof, and he who hearkens to it will find it difficult not to feel that they came from a holy man of old who spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, from that man of God whose name is imperishably inscribed on his prophecies.

The great and leading object of these prophecies seems to be, to fix the era of the first advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to teach that the kingdom of God would be set up at the close of a series of kingdoms, the last of which had been a great oppressor of the Jews. They were also to confirm and strengthen the godly in times of great trial, cheering them with promises of strength equal to their day, and a full participation in every blessing promised as the fruits of the reign of the Messiah. The same office of confirming and strengthening, the visions of Daniel still perform, and were designed to perform, in helping the disciple more firmly to believe that Jesus is the Christ, and, believing, to have life through his name. They are still the more sure word of prophecy, a light shining in a dark place over the manger, and cross, and sepulchre of Jesus, and over the mount of his ascension to God's right hand, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts, (2 Pet. 1: 19,) until with all the other helps there is produced that firm experience

* Comm. p. 10.

of Christ formed in us the hope of glory, which is surer than all outward proof, higher than all miracle—until the dawn of perfect peace, and the star of an unchanging confidence, give the foretokens of the eternal day of glory when God shall be all in all.

Is there not, moreover, a use for these prophecies of which we scarcely have begun to think—that they will be a great and effectual means in persuading the Jews *that their Messiah has indeed come?* On their hearts has long been the vail; but when they begin in the great depths of their sorrows to seek the Lord, the vail shall be taken away, and perceiving all that the prophets have spoken of Jesus, shall become his disciples. The great moral drama of this world will not be closed, until the Jews shall be introduced to bow the knee to Jesus, and confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Then shall even those prophecies which have seemed only to shadow forth spiritual mercies by temporal imagery, be even literally fulfilled in unexampled earthly peace and prosperity. Then in the Father's own time when all things are subdued unto him, shall the quick and the dead be made to stand before Christ the Judge, whose appearing as compared with his first advent to receive his kingdom, is worthy to be preëminently distinguished as his SECOND COMING. To wait for Christ's appearing, is not to expect every moment that he will come forth from his throne in heaven, but to have those vivid feelings respecting it which every thoughtful Christian has at least at times, when that period, even though it be a thousand years off, shall seem to be hastening on, soon as the sun which sets to-day shall come on the morrow. It is to look for the providential indications of his coming, as gathered from the progress of his kingdom, and as a disciple to feel that the arrival of that kingdom is made inseparably connected with his own efforts to extend it through the whole world.

Haverhill, Mass.
July 18, 1842.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAPTER XI.

Page.

The long warfare between the kings of Egypt and Syria, with the calamities it brought on the Jews, ... 13

SECTION II.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAPTER VIII.

The desecration and the cleansing of the sanctuary, . . . 63

SECTION III.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAPTER VII.

The four beasts, the little horn of the fourth, and the reign of the Son of man, ... 93

SECTION IV.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAPTER II: 31—45.

Nebuchadnezzar's Dream, ... 141

SECTION V.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAPTER IX: 24—27.

The vision of the seventy weeks, ... 164

SECTION VI.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAPTER XII.

Conclusion, ... 201

INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL.

CHAPTER XI.

THE LONG WARFARE BETWEEN THE KINGS OF EGYPT AND SYRIA, WITH THE CALAMITIES IT BROUGHT ON THE JEWS.

CHAPTERS x, xi, xii, contain one vision. Chap. x. is introductory, and needs no explanation except what will be given under the other two.

1 Also I, in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and strengthen him.

The introduction does not end with chap. x, but extends through this verse, and through the first clause of the verse following.

Darius the Mede, was the Cyaxares II, son of Astyages, of profane history. He was king of Media, when Babylon was taken by the confederate armies of the Medes and Persians, under the command of Cyrus, then a Persian prince, the son of Mandane, Cyaxares' sister, and of Cambyses, her husband, king of Persia. Darius "was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans" (9: 1) in the year 538 before the Christian era, and the Medes and Persians then began to flow together into one empire—Cyrus consenting that his uncle should have a joint title with him in the government, and yielding him the first place of honor during life. On the death of Darius, about two years afterward, Cyrus, who had married the

daughter of Darius, became sole head of the empire. Comp. Dan. 5: 28, 31 and Isa. 45: 1—3.

Whom did the angel stand to confirm? Darius, or Michael? The two last verses of chap. x. read thus:—"And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Graecia shall come . . . . . and there is none that holdeth with me in these things but Michael your prince." The word translated *holdeth* is only another form of the same verb translated *to confirm;* and the meaning is, that none but Michael joined his strength with Gabriel's, none but Michael assisted and upheld him against the princes of Persia and Greece. Thus also, 10: 13,—"The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but lo Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia." As the angel Gabriel had said, 10: 13, 20, 21, that Michael helped him, so here, in 11: 1, he says that he once helped Michael. The assistance rendered by Michael to Gabriel, was not long before Gabriel appeared in this vision to Daniel, viz. in the third year of the reign of Cyrus, 534 B. C. (See 10: 1.) The aid rendered by Gabriel to Michael was in the first year of Darius, five years before Michael rendered a similar service to him. It was not Darius, therefore, but the angel Michael, the tutelar angel of the Jewish nation, whom Gabriel "stood to confirm."

This language is probably symbolical, though it has for its basis the real existence and agency of angels; and by it events are described which are narrated in plain terms in sacred history. After the Jews had returned to their own land, agreeably to a decree of Cyrus in the first year of his reign, and had begun to build their temple, "the people of the land hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius, [Darius the son of Hystaspes,] king of Persia," Ezra 4: 4, 5. This opposition began as early as the second year of

the return of the Jews, (Ezra 3: 8,) and some injurious influence would seem to have been exerted on the mind of Cyrus, and to have led Daniel to observe a season of humiliation and fasting, 10: 2, 3. During that period of anxiety, Daniel searched the Scriptures still more carefully, (see 10: 12,) to understand whether deliverance from captivity was then truly to come to his countrymen; how soon also the greater deliverance by their Messiah was to come. And the twenty-one days during which Gabriel is represented as having been withstood by the prince of Persia, 10: 13, correspond with the time during which Daniel was fasting. For the event symbolized by the declarations in 10: 20—"When I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Graecia shall come"—see under 11: 3.

2 And now will I shew thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than *they* all: and by his strength through his riches, he shall stir up all against the realm of Graecia.

The word "*the truth*," is, in 10: 21, "that which is noted in the scripture [or book] of truth"—i. e. what is purposed surely to take place. With this clause the introduction ends; and here, or at the end of the first verse, should have been the division of chapters x and xi.

This revelation was made to the prophet, as already noticed, in the third year of the reign of Cyrus, (10: 1,) and it related to long *warfare;* for such is the meaning of the word in that place translated "time appointed." After Cyrus, who died 529 B. C., were (1) Cambyses his son, the Ahasuerus mentioned in Ezra 4: 6, whose reign closed 522 B. C.; (2) Smerdis, an impostor and usurper, the Artaxerxes mentioned in Ezra 4: 7, who perished after a reign of about seven months; (3) Darius, the son of Hystaspes, who married the daughter of Cyrus, and died 486 B. C., having reigned thirty-six years. The fourth king was Xerxes I, who having

made preparation throughout all the Persian empire for three years together, invaded Greece, 480 B. C., at the head of an army of five millions, including the attendants of the camp—though this number, as indeed most accounts of numbers given by the Greek historians of their enemies, may be received with considerable abatement. He also formed an alliance with the Carthagenians, and engaged them to muster an army, (which were collected partly out of Africa, and partly out of Spain and Gaul, and numbered 300,000,) to harass the Greek colonies in Sicily and lower Italy, while he should fall on Greece itself. To prepare such an expedition, and sustain so vast a multitude, caused immense expense; and yet was his wealth still superabundant. There is a remark of Herodotus, which strikingly confirms the last clause of this verse—"What nation was there," says the Greek historian, "that Xerxes led not out of Asia into Greece?"

3 And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will.

This was Alexander the Great, who ascended the throne of Macedon, 336 B. C. Between the death of Xerxes and the commencement of Alexander's reign, there was an interval of one hundred and twenty years; and eight kings more sat on the throne of Persia, the last of whom was Darius Codomanus. Alexander having subdued Egypt and Asia Minor, and destroyed Tyre and Gaza, proceeded against Darius, conquered him, and became master of the whole Persian empire, 331 B. C. He was now lord of all the nations between the Hadriatic Sea and the river Ganges. He ruled with despotic sway; and it may be said of him as was said by the prophet of a king of Babylon, "Whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive, and whom he would he set up, and whom he would he put down," Dan. 5: 19.

When Alexander was in Palestine, and had taken Tyre, he sent out commissaries to obtain provisions. The Jews

refused to furnish supplies, alleging their oath of subjection to Persia. Alexander was so enraged, that as soon as he destroyed Tyre, he marched against Jerusalem, to punish the Jews as severely as he had punished the Tyrians. He was met by the high priest and sanhedrim in their official costume, and by all the people in white robes, in solemn procession, out of the city; and whether from awe at the spectacle, or from recollecting, as Josephus relates it, that the very person now high priest appeared to him in a dream, in Macedonia, and in the name of God promised him success in the war against Persia, (though this dream was probably a device by Alexander to turn the omen of the religious procession to good account, for the encouragement of his army,) whether from one cause or the other, his rage was subdued, he himself did homage to the God of Abraham, and became the patron of the Jews. To this event does the angel probably allude, 10: 20, when he says, "And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia; and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Graecia shall come."

The reason why Xerxes was the last Persian king spoken of, is probably that his expedition into Greece first led the way to the downfall of his kingdom. For he met with a series of disastrous defeats, which stimulated the Greeks to make successive expeditions on their part into Persia, until under Alexander they conquered it. The expedition of Xerxes was in effect the ruin of Persia, and so historians regard it.

4 And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others besides those.

Alexander perished, of a drunken debauch, or, as some say, of poison, at the age of thirty-three, after a reign of about twelve years, when he stood at the height of his conquests.

His kingdom was broken like a potter's vessel. Great confusion arose, on his death, in respect to the succession. For though he had a son by his wife Barsina, named Hercules, and another child was expected by Roxana, and a natural brother, Aridaeus, was living, he refused to bequeath his sceptre to either of them, or to any one else, except, as he said, "to the most worthy." It was at last settled in a conference of his officers, that Aridaeus should be proclaimed king; the expected child by Roxana, if a son, be associated with him in the empire, and the government of the provinces be distributed among the generals. The expected heir was born, Alexander Aegus. Aridaeus was put to death, with many of his friends, after a reign of seven years, by Olympias, Alexander's mother, who had now, by means of her grandson, gotten the power into her own hands. Next she herself was slain, by Cassander, governor of the province of Macedon, in revenge for the death of his brother, one of the number of Aridaeus' friends that had been put to death. Being ambitious of the throne of Macedon, Cassander slew the young king also, at the age of fourteen, with his mother, 310 B. C. And in the year following, Hercules, the remaining son, and his mother, were despatched by the governor of the Peloponnesus, where they then were.

In the year 304 B.C., many of Alexander's generals, among whom the government of the provinces had been distributed, took the name of kings, as they were already in reality, and falling into war and alliance among themselves, were reduced to four, between whom there was a formal division of the kingdom, 301 B. C.; viz. Cassander, who had Macedonia and Greece on the west of Palestine; Lysimachus, who had Thrace, Bithynia, and part of Asia Minor, on the north; Seleucus, who had Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Syria, on the east and north-east, and also considerable territory in Asia Minor; Ptolemy, son of Lagus, who had Arabia, Egypt and Libya on the south, also Palestine and Cœle-Syria, i. e. Hol-

low Syria, the valley lying between the two ridges of the Lebanon mountains, and extending from the 32nd to the 33d degree of latitude, sometimes, however, including more—the eastern boundary line being the mountains on the east and north-east of the Jordan, embracing Philadelphia, and sweeping around Damascus. The phrase "toward the four winds of heaven," does not probably denote here this exact division of four, but means that Alexander's kingdom was divided asunder in every direction. Compare Matt. 24: 31, "He shall gather his elect from the four winds." Thus was Alexander's kingdom plucked up forever, and others besides his heirs were established in his place.

5 And the king of the south shall be strong, and *one* of his princes; and he shall be strong above him, and have dominion; his kingdom *shall be* a great dominion.

The king of the south was the king of Egypt, viz. Ptolemy, son of Lagus—the words "south" and "north" being used to denote the countries lying in those directions from Palestine. He was the first established in his kingdom, and having gained possession of Jerusalem by treachery, (Josephus xii. 1,) he claimed Palestine in the partition of the kingdom. "*One* of his princes," means another of Alexander's chieftains, viz. Seleucus Nicator, who assumed the title of king of Syria; in the next verse "king of the north." Ptolemy was a powerful prince, but Seleucus became mightier than he, and the race of kings, that sprung from him, stronger than the Egyptian, as the sequel of the chapter will show. He is called by the ancient historians "the greatest king after Alexander." He subjected to his sway all the countries from the Hellespont to India, and the era of the Seleucidae dates from his reign. The history of these two kings is now alone taken, because the others had no concern with Judea, and were soon displaced. Judea fell now to one, and then to the other of them, as it had also to Greece, and Persia, and Babylon.

6 And in the end of years they shall join themselves together; for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times.

About fifty years had elapsed from the division of the kingdom in 301 B. C., and Ptolemy I, Seleucus I, and Antiochus I, Soter, his son and successor, were dead. Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, son of Ptolemy I, and Antiochus II, Theus, son of Antiochus I, were now on the thrones of Egypt and Syria,—the appellations "king of the north," and "king of the south," being used here for the *race* of the two respective monarchs of Egypt and Syria. They had been engaged in war with each other, until a peace was agreed on, solicited by Antiochus II, on account of revolts in his eastern provinces. The conditions, to which Antiochus II. submitted, were, that divorcing his first wife Laodice, and disinheriting her children, he should marry Ptolemy's daughter, Berenice, and settle the succession of the kingdom on her male issue. Berenice accordingly came, accompanied by her father, and a large retinue of Egyptian servants, first to Pelusium, and thence by sea to Syria. The phrase which describes the object of her coming, and which is translated "to make an agreement," is literally *to effect an adjustment*, or ratify peace. Ptolemy II. died two years after his daughter's marriage, and thus she retained not the power of the arm, i. e. her father's aid to Syria and herself. "He that begat her," and "strengthened her" was taken away by death. Antiochus also was soon to fall. For having now nothing to hope or to fear from his old enemy, and recent ally, ("arm,") he removed Berenice, and recalled Laodice, who, to prevent a repetition of her disgrace, and redeem her children from disinheritance, took an early opportunity to poison her husband. She also caused Berenice, with her infant son, and very many of her

Egyptian attendants, ("they who brought her,") to be slain, and by a decree forged in the name of the deceased king, procured the succession of the kingdom to Seleucus II, Calinicus, her eldest son, 246 B. C.

For the phrase "he that begat her," there is the marginal reading, in the English Bible, "he whom she brought forth," —i. e. her son who was slain along with her. This reading may be the true one, but it requires an alteration of the present vowels of the Hebrew word.

7 But out of a branch of her roots shall *one* stand up in his estate, which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north, and shall deal against them, and shall
8 prevail: and shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and gold;
9 and he shall continue *more* years than the king of the north. So the king of the south shall come into his kingdom, and shall return into his own land.

"A branch of her roots," was her brother Ptolemy III, Euergetes, by the same father Ptolemy II, whom he succeeded on the throne of Egypt. He hastened, with the army, (the definite article is in the original, also the preposition commonly rendered *to*, which may describe his coming forth to the army to place himself at their head,) to avenge the death of his sister. He made himself master of almost all Syria, slew Laodice, and was subjugating the Syrian provinces in the east, when he was obliged to return home, to quell a sedition that arose in his absence. The "fortress of the king of the north," was probably Seleucia, a fortified place, the sea-port of Syria, one of the nine cities of that name built by Seleucus I. It lay near the mouth of the Orontes, which, flowing from the Lebanon mountains, emptied into the north-eastern section of the Mediterranean. Ptolemy took this city, among others in Syria, placed in it an Egyptian garrison, which held possession for about thirty years, until Antiochus the Great recaptured it. (Comp. under

verse 10.) The chief city of Syria, and residence of the Syrian kings, was Antioch, fifteen miles above Seleucia, on the same river, built also by Seleucus I, and named in honor of his father, or, according to some, of his son and successor, Antiochus I. There is no mention in history, that Ptolemy took Antioch itself. He returned to Egypt, carrying with him out of the Syrian provinces an immense quantity of vessels of silver and gold, and idols to the number of twenty-five hundred, among which were many that Cambyses, son of Cyrus, had seized in an expedition into Egypt, and carried into Persia. The word translated "princes," has in the original the primary meaning of *molten images*, which is doubtless its signification in verse 8.

Some translate the phrase, "shall continue more years," etc., "shall continue some years after the king of the north." This indeed expresses the same sentiment; but the preposition used in this particular connexion, is the common particle to denote the comparative degree.

The last clause of verse 9, grammatically reads, *He* [the king of the north] shall come against the kingdom of the king of the south, and shall return to his own land. Seleucus Callinicus prepared a great army against Ptolemy to recover the dominions which Ptolemy had seized, but he was defeated. A peace having been concluded between them, at the instance of Ptolemy, 243 B. C., Seleucus, some twelve years after, marched into the east, to subdue the province of the Parthians, which had revolted from him. He was overthrown, taken prisoner by Arsaces governor of the Parthians, and confined there until he died of a fall from his horse, 226 B. C. Ptolemy III. out-lived him some four or five years.

10 But his sons shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces: and *one* shall certainly come, and overflow, and pass through: then shall he return, and be stirred up, *even* to his fortress.

The sons of Seleucus Callinicus were Seleucus III, Ceraunus and Antiochus III, the Great. Seleucus Ceraunus succeeded to the throne, and chiefly by the instrumentality of his kinsman Achaeus, was excited ("stirred up") to proceed at the head of an army to the recovery of what had been lost in his father's reign; but proving inefficient, he was poisoned by two of his generals. He was succeeded by his younger brother Antiochus, B. C. 223, then a youth of only fifteen years of age. On the death of Ptolemy III, Euergetes, and the succession of his son Ptolemy IV, Philopater, B. C. 221, Antiochus was influenced by his prime-minister Hermias to proceed directly against the king of Egypt; but his first campaign effected but little. His second resulted in the recapture of Seleucia, and in getting possession also of Ptolemais, Tyre and Damascus, cities of Cœle-Syria, with many cities of Palestine, which, in the partition of Alexander's kingdom, had been assigned to the king of Egypt. He also took Philadelphia beyond Jordan, a place of great strength, the ancient Rabbath-Ammon, rebuilt by P. Philadelphus, and called by his name. The clause, "then shall he return," etc. seems to denote, not the return of Antiochus to his own city, (comp. verse 7,) but his penetrating to one of the fortified cities of the king of Egypt—perhaps Philadelphia, to which he marched, after several battles on the sea coast. Or the word "return" may be connected with the following verb, and have the force of the adverb *again*, (which is a very frequent Hebrew usage,) and here describe his march on his *second* expedition as far as Raphia, a frontier fortress of Egypt.

11 And the king of the south shall be moved with choler, and he shall come forth and fight with him, *even* with the king of the north: and he [the king of the north] shall set forth a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his hand.

P. Philopater in person now took the field, at the head of a large army of 70,000 foot, 5,000 horse, and 73 elephants,

and encamped at Raphia. Antiochus met him with an army of 62,000 foot, 6,000 horse, and 102 elephants, and experienced a total defeat.

12 *And* when he hath taken away the multitude, his heart shall be lifted up; and he shall cast down *many* ten thousands: but he shall not be strengthened *by it.*

P. Philopater was a profligate king, easily elated, and too fond of pleasure to pursue the advantage he had just gained, —otherwise, he might have deprived Antiochus of his whole empire. He made peace with Antiochus on condition of the cession of Palestine and Cœle-Syria, and thus gave Antiochus opportunity to recruit. Much discontent followed in consequence of his lenity to Antiochus, which terminated in open rebellion.

13 For the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and with much riches.

Antiochus having been on an expedition of several years in the east, to subdue rebellions, and strengthen his dominion, now returned with the reputation of a great and valiant prince, and with resources vastly increased.

14 And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall.

To "establish the vision" seems to denote the vision against the king of the south, viz. that "many shall stand up against the king of the south." About the time of the return of Antiochus from the east, Ptol. Philopater died, and Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, his son, was placed on the throne, at five years of age, 204 B. C. There was a conspiracy formed against him in Egypt, as soon as his father died. Very soon after this, Antiochus, and Philip, the fifth king of Macedon

from the death of the sons of Cassander, entered into a league to seize and divide the dominions of the young king. Those designated by the phrase "robbers of thy people,"—robbers of the prophet's countrymen,—could not have been the Romans, as some have supposed; for the Romans were not against, but *for* the young king, and therefore did not confirm the part of the vision which relates to the king of the south. The phrase has been supposed by others* to designate violent men among the Jews, who seized the opportunity of Antiochus' entrance into Palestine, in the second year of Ptolemy's reign, to revolt from Ptolemy, to whom they were then subject, and join Antiochus against him, but who were afterwards severely chastised by Scopas, General of the Egyptian forces, sent to recover Palestine, while Antiochus was absent on an expedition against the king of Pergamos. To this it seems an almost insuperable objection, that those who joined Antiochus are called "upright ones," in v. 17. The phrase more probably designates Scopas himself, who, while discharging his commission to subdue the Jews, had enriched himself with plundering them. He, too, plotted against Ptolemy's life, in the ninth year of his reign, but neglecting the opportunity to strike the blow at once, was discovered, and, with his accomplices, who perhaps were in the army with him, and shared some of the plunder, put to death.

The phrase is literally, *sons of burglars* of thy people. In the Septuagint it is, *sons of the pests* of thy people. The same word translated "robbers," is applied to wild beasts, Is. 35: 9, where it is translated "*ravenous*." It is also applied to those who spoiled and devastated the Jews, Ezek. 7: 22. The word *sons* denotes here, as also in many other places, the *class* or kind of persons.

15 So [Heb. And] the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take the most fenced cities; and the arms of the

* Rosenmüller, Bishop Newton.

south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither *shall*
16 *there be any* strength to withstand. But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed.

Antiochus besieged and took Sidon, Gaza, and other fortified cities in Palestine. Those armies which were as arms to Egypt, for its defence, even its choicest troops, he easily repulsed, and no insurmountable obstacles stood in his way. He then with a small detachment entered the province of Judea,—"the glorious land," (comp. verse 20, also Ezek. 20: 6, 15); but he there encountered so much resistance from an Egyptian garrison left in Jerusalem, that to reduce it he was obliged to summon his whole army. As he was occupied some time in taking the garrison, the sustenance of the land was consumed by the soldiers. And Josephus well remarks on the war between Antiochus and Egypt, that whether the former was conqueror, or was beaten, it was the fate of the Jews to suffer, like a ship tossed in a tempest between the angry billows, Antiq. xii. chap. iii, sec. iii. The last clause may however read, He shall stand in the glorious land, and destruction shall be in his hand. There are some who apply these two verses to the Romans, but it does violence to the context, and proceeds on the suppositon that the Romans are designated by the phrase "robbers of thy people." It would, moreover, be improper for the Romans to receive the title of "king of the north," merely for the victory they afterwards obtained over Antiochus, (verse 18); because they did not take his kingdom from him, nor make him tributary, but simply required him to pay the expenses of the war.

17 He shall also [even] set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him; thus shall he do: and he shall give him the daughter of women, corrupting her: but she shall not stand *on his side*, neither be for him.

Antiochus had fully determined to undertake the conquest of Egypt, and was devoting all his strength to the work. The Jews, here called "upright ones," (i. e. compared with the surrounding heathen, or so called because they were a nation consecrated to God,) had transferred their allegiance from Ptolemy to him, and now aided him against their former master. He gave his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy, for the furtherance of his ambitious schemes, and used his influence to induce her to betray her husband. But she espoused her husband's cause, and joined with him in congratulating the Romans for the victory they obtained over her father. The last clauses may, however, read, And he shall give him a young damsel to ruin it, [i. e. his land,] but it [viz. this device] shall not stand, neither shall it be for him.

18 After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many: but a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease: without his own reproach he shall cause
19 *it* to turn upon him. Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land: but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found.

By "isles," is meant, probably, not islands which he took along the coast of Asia Minor, but the Peloponnesus, and the isles and maritime towns of Greece, then under the protection of the Romans, and confederate with them. Antiochus, to stop the growing power of the Romans eastward, and to check their interference in aid of Egypt against himself, had resolved to wage war against them. With a fleet of about three hundred vessels, he took Rhodes, Samos, Colophon, and penetrated to Euboea, a large island on the eastern coast of Greece. The next season, the Romans came against him, under Acilius, the Consul, and the two armies met at Thermopylae, where Antiochus' army were all cut off, but about five hundred. The year after, conquered both by sea and land, on the coasts of Asia, by the Romans under Lucius Scipio, the Consul, he submitted to a disgraceful peace, the

conditions of which were, that he should quit Asia Minor, and pay the expenses of the war, estimated at 15,000 talents; five hundred down, twenty-five hundred on the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, and the remaining twelve thousand in twelve successive years. He returned to Syria, [in the original it is *forts*, or strong holds, *plural;* i. e. not Antioch only, but the fortified cities of his land;] thence went into his eastern provinces, to replenish his exhausted treasury, entered a temple in the province of Elymais in Babylonia, to seize its treasures, and there perished, with his followers, a victim to the rage of the people at his sacrilege, 187 B. C., after a reign of thirty-six years. Some of the ancient historians say, that he was slain in a drunken carousal by his own men. The victory which the Romans obtained over him, was without one reproachful defeat on their part. The phrase "for his own behalf," v. 18, is the same in the original with the phrase "upon him," at the close of the verse, and the preposition may be rendered either *for* or *upon*. The clause literally reads—*But a prince shall cause his reproach* (i. e. the reproach offered by Antiochus) *to cease for him*—i. e. to Antiochus' own disadvantage.

20 Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes, *in* the glory of the kingdom: but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.

"The glory of the kingdom," is doubtless Palestine, which was the best portion of the kingdom, (comp. note to v. 16, also the designation "fattest places of the province," v. 24.) "A raiser of taxes," etc. is, in the original, one who shall cause the exactor to pass over the glory of the kingdom.—"Stand up in his estate," (to stand upon his base, or in his stead,) is used in the next verse, and also v. 7, to denote regular succession to the empire. To "be destroyed neither in anger nor in battle," is to be despatched in some secret manner, instead of being slain either in a civil commotion, as was

Antiochus the Great, or in war. All these things agree in Seleucus IV, Philopator, and in him alone. He succeeded Antiochus the Great, of whom he was the eldest son. Through the whole of his reign, he was obliged to extort from his subjects the one thousand talents a year, to pay his father's debt to the Romans. The very event of his sending money-collectors into Judea, is recorded in 2 Macc. iii. He reigned only for the short space of ten years, and was "destroyed" by poison administered by Heliodorus, his treasurer, 176 B. C.

There are those who, in their calculation of the end of the world in 1843, apply this 20th verse to Augustus Caesar, and make it a chief point in the construction of their chart of chronology. Now Augustus Caesar cannot be here meant; for, first, Augustus, at Rome, did not succeed Antiochus the Great, in Syria. Antiochus being removed, like a statue from its pedestal, Augustus was not set up in his stead. Secondly, he was not taken away within few days, but reigned forty-five years. Thirdly, he was not "destroyed," not killed in battle, nor despatched in a secret manner, but he died peacefully, in the bosom of his attendants, at the advanced age of seventy-six. To apply the verse to him, therefore, is at variance as well with history, as with the scope of the chapter and laws of language. True, it is recorded in Luke 3: 1, that "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed." But Augustus is not the only monarch who has taxed the people of his empire, or the people of Judea; and two monarchs who agree only in one respect, while they totally differ in others more important, cannot be one and the same.

21 And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries.

The same interpreters suppose that this "vile person" was Tiberius; but as Augustus was not designated in the prece-

ding verse, neither can his successor, Tiberius, be meant in this. It is, moreover, equally opposed to history; for the sovereignty of Rome was repeatedly tendered by the Senate to Tiberius, and at last accepted.

To Seleucus IV, Philopator, Antiochus IV, Epiphanes succeeded, and to him alone does this description answer. He also is the individual designated by "king of the north," and "the king," throughout the remainder of the chapter—as will be made abundantly manifest.

Antiochus Epiphanes was younger brother to Seleucus IV, and had been sent to Rome by his father, Antiochus the Great, as a hostage for the fulfilment of the conditions of peace. Seleucus IV, some time after he ascended the throne, recalled his brother, having first sent to Rome, Demetrius, his own son and lawful heir. Meantime, Seleucus was destroyed before Antiochus Epiphanes reached home. Heliodorus, the treasurer who poisoned Seleucus, as above mentioned, was aiming to get the throne, and he had the consent of a large portion of the people. There were a part also in favor of Ptolemy VI, Philometor, a youth only twelve years old, who had succeeded to Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, and whose mother was sister to the deceased king, Seleucus, and therefore to Antiochus. But Antiochus Epiphanes, by flattering professions and promises, having obtained the help of Eumenes, king of Pergamos, and of Attalus, his brother, procured the expulsion of Heliodorus, and securely seated himself on the throne, with no open resistance on the part of the people—they, too, having been conciliated by his flattering professions.

The phrase "honor of the kingdom," is not exactly the same with "glory of the kingdom," v. 20, and seems to be employed to denote the majesty of royalty, not Palestine, which had already been called "glory of the kingdom."

Antiochus Epiphanes was most fitly called "a vile person." He lounged about the streets of Antioch, drunk, and caroused

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

with the dissipated, sung songs and played on his flute to promote their merriment, and gratified his brutal lust in open sight of the people. So outrageous were his acts of folly and shame, that he was often called, not by his title, Epiphanes, *the illustrious*, but Epimanes, *the mad-man*. He would parade the streets of Antioch in a long robe, with a garland of roses on his head, and if any attempted to pass by him, he would pelt them with stones, which he carried concealed under his garment. At games in honor of Jupiter Olympius, in the groves of Daphne, near Antioch, he rode, in procession, on a miserable horse. At the feast, suddenly throwing up his cup and food, he ran the whole circuit of the table, and in the concluding entertainment by comedians, played antics, naked, along with them. Such are only a few exhibitions of his *vileness*, among the many which history records.

22 And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant.

The very first year of his reign opened with injuries to the Jews. Onias, at that time High Priest, was removed, to give place to Jason his brother, who had obtained it of the king by paying a large sum of money, and by promising to use the influence of his station in bringing the Jews over to heathen manners and customs. Onias had held the office twenty-four years, and it is recorded that "the laws were kept very well, because of the godliness of Onias the High Priest, and his hatred of wickedness," 2 Macc. 3: 1.

As soon as Jason entered upon his office, he began, in accordance with his promise, to induce his countrymen to adopt heathen manners and customs; he set them a signal example, in sending to Tyre, to the celebration in honor of Hercules, at which the king was present, an offering of three hundred talents; he instituted the exercises of the gymnasium, in Jerusalem, which seduced the priests as well as the

people from regular attendance on the duties of the temple, 2 Macc. 4: 12, 14, 18, 19.

In the year 172 B. C., Jason's younger brother, Menelaus, by offering a still higher price for the high-priesthood, received an appointment from the king to the office, and Jason was required to retire. Menelaus found his brother's party too strong for him, and he returned unsuccessful to Antioch. On his solemnly abjuring the Jewish religion, along with his followers, and promising to bring the whole nation to apostatize to the religion of the heathen—an event which Jason had not yet accomplished, to any general extent—he obtained such aid from the king as Jason could not resist, and became established in the high-priesthood, 171 B. C. Then began to ensue a wide-spread, general apostasy.* This same year also, Menelaus, on being summoned before the king, because he had neglected to pay the price of his promotion, left his brother, Lysimachus, as his deputy, who took many of the golden vessels out of the temple, to discharge Menelaus' debt to the king. This act of Lysimachus produced a tumult in which he was slain, near the treasury, within the precincts of the temple.

Onias, after long confinement at Antioch, was treacherously slain at the instigation of Menelaus, whom he had severely reproved for the recent sacrilege committed by Lysimachus. His removal, terminating in violent death, (though his death was not with consent of the king,) is described in the last clause of the verse,—"yea, also the prince of the covenant" [shall be broken]. Substantially the same appellation is given to the high priests in Is. 43: 28, viz. "the princes of the sanctuary." Prince of the covenant, means head of the religious institutions of the Jews, or, which is the same thing, head of the sanctuary where those institutions were observed. Some

* It is observed in Henry's Commentary, that Josephus dates this defection in the 142nd year of the Seleucidæ,—i. e. 171 B. C.—the 6th month and 6th day of the month; but this date cannot be found.

interpreters have translated this last clause "the prince that is allied with him," viz. Ptolemy Philometor, his nephew. But it is a great objection to this interpretation, that the word "covenant" always means, in Daniel, the holy covenant of the Jews, and that the idea of alliance, when meant, is conveyed by another word—which is also used twice in this prophecy, viz. in verses 6, 23; where in v. 6, it is translated "shall join themselves together," and in v. 23, "after the league made with him."

Nor can the phrase "prince of the covenant," mean our Lord Jesus Christ; for the "vile person" being Antiochus Epiphanes, and not Tiberius in whose reign our Lord Jesus was crucified, so the object of that vile person's violence could not have been our Savior. Christ is indeed called the "mediator of the new covenant," and in Mal. 3: 1, is designated as the "messenger of the covenant." But it is to be remembered that he shares many names in common with others, such as "Apostle and High Priest," etc. Heb. 3: 1.

To the calamities above narrated, and to yet others following them, was the language most applicable, "With the arms of a flood [as by a wide-reaching flood], shall they be overflown from before him."

23 And after the league *made* with him he shall work deceitfully: for [Heb. and] he shall come up and become strong with a small people.

The context would seem to denote a league made with the Jews. Josephus remarks, on an occasion which will be noticed under verse 28, that Antiochus Epiphanes "pretending peace, got possession of the city by treachery, and ventured to break the league he had made," Book xii. ch. v. sec. iv. And again, in his second book against Apion, sec. vii., "He [the king] attacked us while we were his associates and friends." With comparatively small forces, reduced under the reign of his two predecessors, he had become mighty; and

his success and growing power led him to violate the pledges, which he had given, in his feebler condition, to induce the provinces attached to his kingdom still to adhere to him.

Possibly the first clause of verse 23, has its explanation in the following note in Prideaux's Connexions, Vol. II. p. 129, where he quotes from Athenæus, "These expenses were made partly out of the prey, which, contrary to his faith given, he took in Egypt, from king Philometer, then a minor."

24 He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province; and he shall do *that* which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: *yea*, and he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds, even for a time.

In the year 173 B. C., Antiochus sent Apollonius to Egypt, to congratulate the young king on the occasion of his becoming of age, and receiving the crown—for until then, the affairs of Egypt were conducted by the regency of his mother, with the assistance of the ministers of state. He learned, on Apollonius' return, that the Egyptian government were "not well affected to his affairs," and were intending to recover Palestine. He accordingly "provided for his own safety," and "came to Joppa, and from thence to Jerusalem, where he was honorably received of Jason, and of the city, and was brought in with torch-light, and with great shoutings; and so afterward went with his host unto Phenice," 2 Macc. 4: 21, 22. This expedition of Antiochus was to prevent the frontiers and fortified cities from falling into the hands of Ptolemy, and to put all things into a thorough posture of defence. He had come into the possession of the territory of Palestine and Cœle-Syria, securely, and without open resistance—or possibly the word "peaceably" may denote both in this verse and verse 21, comparatively quiet times. He scattered among his soldiers and partizans, most freely, gold, silver and rewards, the spoils of the provinces in which he gave them rule,

or through which he led them in his expeditions—and this to attach them more closely to his interests. Profusion and prodigality were characteristic of him. In his drunken moments, he often threw money among the crowd, and gave gold to entire strangers whom he accidentally met, and sometimes presented great sums of money to cities in his kingdom. There is a remark, in point, in 1 Macc. 3: 30, "He feared he should not be able to have such gifts to give so liberally as he did before; for he had abounded above the kings that were before him." Comp. also 2 Macc. 5: 15, 16, quoted under verse 28.

25 And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him.

Two years after Ptolemy VI. was crowned, Antiochus resolved not to wait for the threatened expedition of Egypt into Palestine, but himself to carry the war into the enemy's country. He marched toward the frontiers of Egypt, where he met Ptolemy's army; and mainly by stratagem and greater skill, ["forecasting devices," laying and executing his schemes,] he obtained the victory. At this time he attempted nothing further, but returned to Tyre, put his army into winter quarters, and made preparations for a vigorous campaign the next season.

26 Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army [the army of Antiochus] shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain.

In the opening of the year 170 B. C., Antiochus began his next campaign. It is thus narrated in 1 Macc. 1: 17—19, "He entered into Egypt with a great multitude, with chariots, and elephants, and horsemen, and a great navy, and made war against Ptolemee king of Egypt: but Ptolemee was afraid of

him, and fled; and many were wounded to death. Thus they got the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils thereof." Ptolemy's army met Antiochus' on the borders of Egypt, and were overcome, and Pelusium, a frontier city, was taken by the invaders. Antiochus followed up his advantage, poured his forces into Egypt as a flood, penetrated into the heart of the empire, made himself master of all but Alexandria, and Ptolemy himself came into his hands.

By the phrase "they that feed of the portion of his meat," are designated the king's ministers, Comp. Dan. 1:5, 15, 19. Now Eulæus, prime minister of state, to whom the young prince's education was intrusted, had corrupted him with all manner of luxury and effeminacy. Together with Lennæus, his associate minister of state, after having demanded, in the name of the young king, the territory of Palestine, he adopted measures most inefficient and inadequate; and it was probably through the influence of these same ministers that Ptolemy surrendered his person to Antiochus. Thus "they that fed of the portion of his meat," prepared the way for these disastrous defeats. The word rendered "destroy" literally means *to break*, and is found elsewhere in such connections as the following—"Reproach hath broken my heart"—"I have broken the arm of Pharaoh," Ps. 69: 20. Ezek. 30: 21. It denotes not the literal destruction of his person, but the ruin of his fortunes, the overthrow of his power.

27 And both these kings' hearts *shall be* to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end *shall be* at the time appointed.

Antiochus and Ptolemy each endeavored to circumvent the other. Antiochus, at whose table Ptolemy ate, professed, but falsely, to manage the affairs of Egypt as guardian to the young king, his sister's son. Meantime the Alexandrians, looking on Philometor as lost, and having his younger brother with them, put him on the throne, with the title of Ptolemy

Euergetes II. Antiochus, who had found Alexandria too strong for him, laid a scheme, at the close of an expedition the year following, to engage the two brothers in war, so that the whole kingdom, weakened by intestine troubles, might become his surer and more easy prey. But Philometor began now to be roused by his misfortunes from his effeminacy and sloth; he saw through the plots of Antiochus, and the two brothers coming to an agreement that both should reign conjointly, they sent embassadors to Greece for auxiliary forces. Thus what seemed to promise so well for Antiochus' prosperity, amounted to nothing. His power to oppress was not to continue, his kingdom not to grow more and more extensive, and powerful, and permanent, but to be broken to pieces and destroyed, at the time appointed in the councils of Heaven, Comp. verse 36. The word translated "time appointed," is here altogether different from that in 10: 1, See under verse 2.

28 Then shall he [Heb. And he shall] return into his land with great riches; and his heart *shall be* against the holy covenant; and he shall do *exploits*, and return to his own land.

While Antiochus was in Egypt on his second expedition, in the year 170 B. C., a report spread at the north that he was dead, and Jason, who had been compelled to give place to Menelaus, (see under verse 22,) now thinking it a favorable moment to recover his office, marched to Jerusalem with a thousand men, and aided by many of his party residing in the city, forced Menelaus into the fortress on mount Zion, and made great slaughter of those he thought his adversaries. An exaggerated rumor of the occurrence reaching Antiochus, and leading him to suppose the Jews had revolted, he hastened thither on his return to Antioch, laden with the rich spoils of his Egyptian campaign. Jason fled at his approach, and finally perished a miserable exile, in Lacedemonia. Antiochus entered Jerusalem with his army; and though it had not revolted, yet he was so enraged at learning the people made great

rejoicings at the report of his death, that he plundered the city, and slew 40,000 of its inhabitants, and made slaves of as many more.* "Not content with this, he presumed to go into the most holy temple of all the world; Menelaus, that traitor to the laws, and to his own country, being his guide: and taking the holy vessels with polluted hands, and with profane hands pulling down the things that were dedicated by other kings to the augmentation, and glory, and honor of the place, he gave them away." He also "carried out of the temple 1800 talents," 2 Macc. 5: 15, 16, 21. Comp. also, 1 Macc. 20—24. Having perpetrated these deeds, and "left governors to vex the nation—at Jerusalem, Philip, for his country a Phrygian, and for manners more barbarous than he that set him there; and at Gerizim, Andronicus; and beside, Menelaus, who worse than all the rest bare an heavy hand over the citizens, having a malicious mind against his countrymen, the Jews," 2 Macc. 5: 22, 23—having done these things, he returned to his own land.† The phrase "he shall do exploits" is, in the original, like that in v. 17, "thus shall he do,"—i. e. shall accomplish his purpose.

29 At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.

At the time appointed in the councils of heaven, he went again to Egypt with a large army of foot and cavalry, enraged at the combination of the two Ptolemies, and determined to

* It is said in 2 Macc. 5: 11, that Antiochus "took the city by force of arms." Josephus says, Book xii. chap vii., that he "entered the city without fighting, those of his own party opening the gates to him." Probably he used force at first, the inhabitants through fear making some resistance against his entrance; but soon the gates were opened in the manner Josephus relates.

† Prideaux and others relate, that Antiochus sacrificed a swine at this time, and with part of the flesh made a broth which he sprinkled all over the temple. But it is not mentioned by Josephus, or in the two books of the Maccabees.

wage a more furious war. But this expedition, unlike either of the others, was destined to be abortive, and calamitous to himself. The clause "it shall not be as the former, or as the latter," may read, it shall not be the latter time as at the former.

30 For the ships of Chittim shall come against him; therefore he
shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy
covenant: so shall he do [and shall execute his purpose]; he
shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the
31 holy covenant. And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall
pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily
sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.

Kittim, or Chittim, occurs in Gen. 10: 4, as a name of one of the sons of Javan, by whom the isles of the Gentiles were divided. As in many other like instances, the name of the person was given to the place which he settled. Chittim is generally mentioned in the Bible as a place to and from which the communication was by ships, Num. 24: 24. Jer. 2: 10. Ezek. 27: 6. Is. 23: 12. It is applied, in 1 Macc 1: 1, to Macedonia and Greece. The following is from Josephus, Book i. ch vi. sec. i.—Cethimus [Chittim] possessed the island Cethima: it is now called Cyprus; and from that it is, that all islands, and the greatest part of the sea-coasts are named Cethim [Chittim or Kittim] by the Hebrews."—The phrase "holy covenant," is synonymous with the sacred institutions, the holy religion, of the Jews.—The phrase, "sanctuary of strength," is literally *sanctuary, the strong place*—which it truly was. Tacitus, in his History, Bk. v. sec. 12, speaks of it as built "after the manner of a citadel and proper wall: the porches by which it was surrounded were a most excellent fortress." This epithet of *strength* is found also in Ps. 96: 6,—"Strength and beauty are in his sanctuary."

The words "daily sacrifice," are in the original, *the perpetual*. The phrase is found in full, in Num. 28: 3, 6, 10, etc.; also Ex. 29: 38—42, (where the account of its institu-

tion is given) viz. *the continual burnt offering*, i. e. the sacrifice continually offered morning and evening. The epithet "the continual," (for it has the article,) distinguishes it from the other sacrifices, and would naturally become the familiar and elliptical designation of this chief rite.

The clause, "arms shall stand on his part," means that armed forces shall stand forth at his command, shall be constituted by him and sent forth to execute his purpose.

When Antiochus entered Egypt on his last expedition, 168 B. C., he marched direct to Alexandria, the reduction of which would have made him absolute master of the whole kingdom. But he encountered an unexpected obstacle. Ptolemy Euergetes II, whom the Alexandrians placed on the throne, had sent to Rome for aid, and the Senate decreed to send an embassy of three distinguished individuals, whose commission was to go to Antiochus, and inform him that if he persisted in the war, the Roman nation would thenceforth treat him as an enemy. They came first to Brundusium, a seaport in the heel of Italy, thence sailed to the coast of Greece, thence by way of Chalcis, and the islands Delos and Rhodes, to Alexandria. They met Antiochus four miles above the city, as he was proceeding to besiege it. Antiochus recognized in Popilius, one of the ambassadors, an acquaintance during his former residence at Rome, and he extended his hand to salute him. But Popilius declined, until he knew whether Antiochus were the friend of Rome, and would comply with the decree of the Senate. Antiochus requested time for deliberation; but Popilius drew with his staff a circle round him in the sand, and demanded an answer before he stepped out of it. Through dread of the Roman power, he answered affirmatively. He immediately left Egypt, and to give vent to his chagrin and rage at being thus baffled in his designs, he detached from his army, on his return to Antioch, a body of 22,000 soldiers, under Apollonius, one of his generals, to ravage Jerusalem. The particulars of Apollonius'

attack are thus given in the first and second books of the Maccabees, 1: 30—40. 5: 25, 26, —"Coming to Jerusalem, and pretending peace, he forbore till the holy day of the sabbath, when taking the Jews keeping holy day, he commanded his men to arm themselves. And so he slew all them that were gone to the celebrating of the sabbath, and running through the city with weapons slew great multitudes. And when he had taken the spoils of the city, he set it on fire, and pulled down the houses and walls thereof on every side. But the women and children took they captive, and possessed the cattle. Then builded they the city of David with a great and strong wall, with mighty towers, and made it a strong hold for them, and it was a place to lie in wait against the sanctuary. Thus they shed innocent blood on every side of the sanctuary and defiled it: insomuch that the inhabitants of Jerusalem fled because of them: whereupon the city was made an habitation of strangers, and became strange to those that were born in her, and her sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness." From this time forth, the daily sacrifice ceased.

These ravages were with the concurrence and counsel of some of the apostate Jews. Josephus describes Menelaus as "the origin of all the mischief, by persuading Antiochus Epiphanes to compel the Jews to leave the religion of their fathers," and adds that he "had been a wicked and impious man, who, in order to get the government to himself, had compelled his nation to transgress their own laws," Book xii, ch. ix. sec. vii. Throughout these persecutions, and those which followed, apostate Jews entered into the wicked designs of the king, and delivered up such as they could find faithful to their religion. Comp. Josephus, Book xiii. ch. i. sec. i.

There followed still worse oppressions. Antiochus wrote to the provinces of his kingdom, that all should leave their own religious institutions, and conform to such as he should appoint; and he sent officers to Jerusalem and the cities of Judea, to enforce his decree. "Then many of the people

were gathered unto them, to wit, every one that forsook the law; and so they committed evils in the land; and drove the Israelites into secret places, even wheresoever they could flee for succor. Now the fifteenth day of the month Casleu [about the 5th of Dec.], in the hundred forty and fifth year, (i. e. of the Syrian epoch, 168 B. C.), they set up the abomination of desolation, dedicated the temple to Jupiter Olympius, and builded idol-altars throughout the cities of Juda on every side; and burnt incense at the doors of their houses, and in the streets. And when they had rent in pieces the books of the law which they found, they burnt them with fire. And whosoever was found with any book of the testament, or if any consented to the law, the king's commandment was, that they should put him to death. Now the five and twentieth day of the month, they did sacrifice upon the idol-altar, which was upon the altar of God. At which time, according to the commandment, they put to death certain women, that had caused their children to be circumcised. And they hanged the infants about their necks, and rifled their houses, and slew them that had circumcised them," 1 Macc. 1: 52—61. 2 Macc. 6: 1—6. The placing of the idol-altar on the altar of God, and the sacrifice upon it, was the profane act and token, by which the sanctuary was thenceforth to be desolate. And shortly, shrubs began to grow in the deserted courts of the Lord, as in a forest, 1 Macc. 14: 38.*

* Verses 30, 31 have received a most erroneous interpretation from several recent writers, who calculate the end of the world in A. D. 1843. The taking away of the daily sacrifice, they assert to be the abolition of the pagan sacrifices, in the Roman empire, and they assign this event to A. D. 508. But they come down to it from their point of departure in verses 20, 21: and it can need no further words to show, that in that point they made a total mistake, and therefore have erred all the way. The king under whom the daily sacrifice—the continual burnt-offering—was taken away, was, as the context shows, the same king mentioned in verse 21; and that

32 And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt
by flatteries: but the people that do know their God shall be strong,
33 and do *exploits*. And they that understand among the people shall
instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by
34 captivity, and by spoil, *many* days. Now when they shall fall,
they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall cleave to
35 them with flatteries. And *some* of them of understanding shall
fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make *them* white, *even* to
the time of the end: because *it is* yet for a time appointed.

Events already narrated illustrate these verses in part. Some others will now be adduced from the two histories of

---

king was Antiochus Epiphanes, to whom all history assigns deeds that correspond precisely with the predictions in these two verses.

In respect to a regular morning and evening sacrifice among the heathen—the continual burnt-offering—the Bible nowhere alludes to such a thing, and it applies the phrase "the continual burnt-offering," to no other sacrifices than were offered by divine command on the altar of God.

The advocates of this interpretation affirm that the first clause of verse 30—"the ships of Chittim shall come against him"—denotes the incursions of the Goths upon the Roman empire. Now to say nothing of making the Romans synonymous with "king of the north," when in fact the Romans were not masters of Syria, the application of Chittim to the Goths is manifestly against the ancient usage. For Chittim was applied to the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean, but the Goths inhabited northern and central Europe. Moreover they made their incursions against Rome not in ships, but by land.

The advocates of the interpretation abovementioned also affirm, that the phrase "sanctuary of strength" denotes the city Rome, and yet they bring, and can bring, no scriptural authority whatever for such an application. The word "sanctuary" primarily denotes the holy tabernacle, or the temple in Jerusalem. It is figuratively applied to Jehovah; Is. 8: 14; to heaven, Ps. 102: 19; and to Judah, Ps. 114: 2. See further on 8: 11—14.

As to the time fixed on for the abolition of the pagan sacrifices, viz. A. D. 508, it altogether contradicts history, and is a mere arbitrary assumption without the support of one historian who assigns any important event to that year. Gibbon, in his chapter on the "Final De-

the life and times of the Maccabees, in which every specification in these verses has a remarkable fulfilment. There dwelt in the humble village of Modin, in the tribe of Dan, between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean, a priest by the name of Mattathias, who had five sons, John, Simon, Judas Maccabeus, Eleazar and Jonathan. To this village the king's officers came to carry into effect the recent decree. They addressed Mattathias in language which furnishes an instance of the "flatteries" used to "corrupt" the Jews, and which, as we

---

struction of Paganism," says, that the emperor "Theodosius attacked superstition in her most vital part by prohibiting the use of sacrifices. The temples of the Roman empire [A. D. 390] were deserted or destroyed; but the ingenious superstition of the Pagans still attempted to elude the laws of Theodosius, by which all sacrifices had been severely prohibited. The inhabitants of the country disguised their religious, under the appearance of convivial, meetings. These vain pretences were swept away by the last edict of Theodosius [A. D. 392]; which inflicted a deadly wound on the superstition of the Pagans. And so rapid, yet so gentle, was the fall of paganism, that only twenty-eight years after the death of Theodosius, [he died A. D. 395,] the faint and minute vestiges were no longer visible to the eye of the legislator;" Vol. II. pp. 183—194. Comp. Milman's note to p. 187; also Gieseler's Church History, Vol. I. pp. 180—190. It is true indeed that notwithstanding the edicts of Theodosius, all idolatrous worship was not rooted out; but *the public heathen sacrifices were utterly taken away*, and the fatal blow had been given to Paganism itself, which, after lingering many years, finally died out of the empire, about A. D. 600. It is worthy of notice, that those who calculate the end of the world in 1843, fix on the year 1798 as the date when Papacy was virtually ended, though it still lingers. So, to be consistent, must they assent to the year 392, as the date when the heathen sacrifices were actually abolished, and pagan worship virtually ended, though it lingered some years longer. The assertion in the prophet, "shall take away the daily sacrifice," leaves them indeed no alternative but to fix on the year 423 (395+28), as the furthest possible period for the abolition of the pagan sacrifice, if they will have that to be the meaning of the phrase; and they must change their mode of reckoning, or insist upon it that the world came to an end some hundred years ago.

have already seen, influenced many to abandon their religion. "Thou art a ruler," said they, "and an honorable and great man in this city, and strengthened with sons and brethren. Now therefore come thou first, and fulfil the king's commandment, like as all the heathen have done, yea and the men of Juda also, and such as remain at Jerusalem; so shalt thou and thy house be in the number of the king's friends, and thou and thy children shall be honored with silver and gold, and many rewards." In his case they were unsuccessful; and in the answer he returned, and his subsequent deeds, and the deeds of his sons, and of his sons' followers, we have a fulfilment of what is asserted in these verses. "Though all the nations," Mattathias answered with a loud voice, "though all the nations that are under the king's dominion obey him, and fall away every one from the religion of their fathers, yet will I, and my sons, and my brethren, walk in the covenant of our fathers. We will not hearken to the king's words, to go from our religion, either on the right hand or the left." When one of the Jews came forward, induced by the king's flatteries, to sacrifice on the idol-altar, Mattathias rushed on him, and slew him, and the king's commissioner with him, and pulled down the altar, and crying with a loud voice through the city, "Whosoever is zealous of the law, and maintaineth the covenant, let him follow me," he and his sons fled into the mountains. That was the rallying cry, which called together "all such as were voluntarily devoted to the law," and "all they that fled for persecution." Having "joined their forces, they went round about, and pulled down the altars, and what children soever they found within the coast of Israel uncircumcised, those they circumcised valiantly, and they recovered the law out of the hand of the Gentiles." Mattathias, old in years, but young in valor and hope, died, having first charged his sons,—"Be ye zealous for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers." "In his stead rose up Judas, called Maccabeus,

whom his father Mattathias had also named as his successor. "He was mighty and strong even from his youth up. He put on a breastplate as a giant, and girt his warlike harness about him, and made battles, protecting the host with his sword. In his acts he was like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring for his prey. For he pursued the wicked, and consumed those that vexed his people, and salvation prospered in his hand." With a band so small in comparison with the enemy, that they asked, on the enemy's approach, "How shall we be able, being so few, to fight against so great a multitude and so strong," they waged four signal battles, in which they defeated and routed the enemy. The first was against Apollonius, the governor of Samaria, (the same whom Antiochus had detached to ravage Jerusalem and take away the daily sacrifice,) who came upon Judas and his band with a large army, but was defeated and himself slain; whose "sword also Judas took, and therewith he fought all his life long." Next, Seron, lieutenant of Coele-Syria, came against Judas, and a second time the Jews were successful. At this, Antiochus was so vexed, that he "gathered together all the forces of his realm," to crush at once the rising Jews; but being, at this moment imperatively obliged to go in another direction, (as will be hereafter related, v. 44,) he thereupon took half his forces with him, and committed the other half to Lysias, a prince royal, with orders to proceed at once to Jerusalem. Lysias, occupied in affairs of state, committed the army to Nicanor and Gorgias, distinguished and experienced men, who accordingly went forth; Nicanor, in his confidence of success, proclaiming that he would sell Jews at the rate of ninety for a talent, and leading after him merchants to buy them. And yet with such a host they did not encounter Judas in open battle; but a detachment of 5000 was sent under Gorgias, to surprise and cut off Judas by night. Judas heard of it, and counter-marched to surprise the main body of Nicanor. He came upon them at early

dawn, with his band then numbering only 3000 against 35,000, and totally routed them, and slew 3000—each brave Israelite his man. The detachment returning, and perceiving the result, which the tents beginning to be set on fire plainly declared, they also fled. At intelligence of this, "Lysias, confounded and discouraged, gathered together, the next year following, (165 B. C.) 60,000 choice men of foot and 5,000 horsemen. So they came into Idumea, and pitched their tents at Bethsura, and Judas met them with 10,000 men." The enemy were again totally defeated, and 5,000 of their number slain. "Then said Judas and his brethren, Behold, our enemies are discomfited: let us go up to cleanse and dedicate the sanctuary. Upon this, all the host assembled themselves together, and went up into mount Sion. And when they saw the sanctuary desolate, and the altar profaned, and the gates burned up, and shrubs growing in the courts as in a forest, or in one of the mountains, they rent their clothes, and made great lamentation, and cast ashes upon their heads." There were soldiers yet in the fortress to hinder any from going to worship in the sanctuary. "Then Judas appointed certain men to fight against those in the fortress, until he had cleansed the sanctuary. So he chose priests of blameless conversation, such as had pleasure in the law: who cleansed the sanctuary, and bear out the defiled stones, and built a new altar of burnt-offering, and hallowed the courts, and made new holy vessels—the candlestick, the altar of incense, and the table of shew-bread; and upon the altar they burned incense, and the lamps that were upon the candlestick they lighted, and set the loaves upon the table, and spread out the vails." Having completed the whole, "they rose up early on the morning of the 25th day of their 9th month Casleu, (about the 15th of Dec.) in the 148th year of the epoch of Syria, (165 B. C.) and offered sacrifice according to the law upon the new altar of burnt offerings." Then was the daily sacrifice, which had been taken away

restored. On that same day was the temple "dedicated with songs, and citherns, and harps, and cymbals, and all the people fell upon their faces, worshipping and praising the God of heaven, who had given them good success. They kept the dedication of the altar eight days, and sacrificed the sacrifice of deliverance and praise; they also decked the fore front of the temple with crowns of gold, and with shields, and the gates and chambers they renewed, and hanged doors upon them." This feast of dedication was made thenceforth an annual festival to be celebrated eight days. It was observed even down to our Savior's time, and he attended its celebration, John 10: 22. It is called by Josephus, the Feast of Lights, because the city was illuminated as expressive of the people's joy, Antiq. B. xii. c. 11. At the same time when they had purified the sanctuary and renewed the daily sacrifice, they also "builded up the mount Sion with high walls and strong towers round about, lest the Gentiles should come and tread it down, as they had done before."*

There were many other instances of individual godly men and women, whose sufferings and heroic constancy further illustrate this prophecy. They were among the wise who instructed many. No threats nor promises could induce them to forsake the religion of their fathers, no tortures intimidate them; but they met death courageously and cheerfully, in its most appalling forms. There was an aged man named Eleazer, a chief scribe, whom the king's officers had tried in vain with persuasions to eat swine's flesh offered in sacrifice on one of the pagan altars. They then forced a piece into his mouth, but he spat it out again; and on being urged to partake secretly of meat of his own providing, and appear as though he ate swine's flesh, that he might thus escape the violent death his refusal would inevitably bring on him, he nobly replied, "It becometh not our age in any wise to dissemble, whereby many young persons might think that Elea-

* For all these quotations, see 1 Macc. chaps. 2—4.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zer, being fourscore years old and ten, were now gone to a strange religion; and so they, through mine hypocrisy, and desire to live a little time and a moment longer, should be deceived by me, and I get a stain to mine old age, and make it abominable. For though for the present time I should be delivered from the punishment of men, yet should I not escape the hand of the Almighty, neither alive nor dead. Wherefore now manfully changing this life, I will shew myself such an one as mine age requireth, and leave a notable example to such as be young, to die willingly and courageously for the honorable and holy laws." When he had thus spoken, he went voluntarily to the place of torture; and being just ready to expire under the stripes inflicted, he groaned and said, "It is manifest unto the Lord, that hath the holy knowledge, that whereas I might have been delivered from death, I now endure sore pains in body by being beaten; but in soul am well content to suffer these things, because I fear him." Thus he died, "leaving his death for an example of a noble courage, and a memorial of virtue, not only unto young men, but unto all his nation."*

Another instance was that of the torture of seven brothers with their mother, before king Antiochus himself, whose presence at Jerusalem was probably occasioned by intelligence of the constancy of the Jews; and this he was determined to break by the most violent measures. The eldest of these brothers, who was the first to speak, exclaimed—"What wouldest thou ask or learn of us? We are ready to die, rather than to transgress the laws of our fathers." Antiochus in a rage, and to make him such an example of severity as he supposed would at once subdue the others, commanded a cauldron to be made red hot, into which he threw him yet alive, having first cut off the hands and feet and tongue of his victim, the other brethren and the mother looking on; "and as the vapor of the pan was for a good space dispersed,

* 2 Maccabees, ch. vi.

they exhorted one another with the mother to die manfully." They then seized the second, with a savage violence that "pulled off the skin of his head with the hair," and asked, "Wilt thou eat, before thou be punished throughout every member of thy body?" And on his answering "No," he was made to undergo the same torture with his brother; and with his expiring breath he said, "Thou like a fury takest us out of the present life, but the King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life." After him the third came forward, and "putting out his tongue and holding forth his hands, as required, he said courageously, These I had from heaven; and for his laws I despise them; and from him I hope to receive them again. Insomuch that the king, and they that were with him, marvelled at the young man's courage and that he nothing regarded the pains." Next came the fourth, whom "they tormented and mangled in like manner," and who, when he was about to die, spake to the king,—"It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by him: as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life." And thus on to the seventh, the youngest, whom the king, wishing to redeem himself from the disgrace of a total failure, endeavored to corrupt by flatteries, and "also assured him with oaths, that he would make him both a rich and a happy man, if he would turn from the laws of his fathers; and that also he would take him for his friend, and trust him with affairs. But when the young man would in no case hearken unto him, the king called his mother and exhorted her that she would counsel the young man to save his life." She promised him that she would counsel her son. She had already counseled them all, she had "exhorted every one of them in her own language, filled with courageous spirits,—I neither gave you breath nor life, neither was it I that formed the members of every one of you; but doubtless the Creator of the world, who formed the generation of man, and found out the begin-

ning of all things, will also of his own mercy give you breath and life again, as ye now regard not your own selves for his laws' sake." Then "bowing herself toward the king, and laughing the cruel tyrant to scorn," she addressed her youngest son "in her country language in this manner: I beseech thee, my son, look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not; and so was mankind made likewise. Fear not this tormentor, but being worthy of thy brethren, take thy death, that I may receive thee again in mercy with thy brethren." While the mother was yet speaking these words, the young man said, "Whom wait ye for? I will not obey the king's commandment; but I will obey the commandment of the law that was given unto our fathers by Moses. And thou, that hast been the author of all mischief against the Hebrews, shalt not escape the hands of God. For our brethren, who have now suffered a short pain, are dead under God's covenant of everlasting life; but thou, through the judgment of God, shalt receive just punishment for thy pride. But I, as my brethren, offer up my body and life for the laws of our fathers, beseeching God that he would speedily be merciful unto our nation; and that thou by torments and plagues mayest confess, that he alone is God. Then the king, being in a rage, handled him worse than all the rest, and took it grievously that he was laughed to scorn. So this man died undefiled, and put his whole trust in the Lord. Last of all, after the son, the mother died."*

While these transactions took place in Jerusalem, the Jews suffered much out of it. Their trials did not end with the splendid victories of Judas already related, and the purification of the sanctuary. That very purification displeased the heathen round about; and making common cause with Antiochus, they resolved "to destroy the generation of Jacob," and accordingly began the work. The men in many places

* 2 Maccabees, ch. vii.

were slain by the thousand, their property borne away, their wives and children sold into captivity. In Gilead and Galilee they were in the greatest peril, besieged in their cities, and would have perished but for the timely aid of Judas in the former, (to whom they in their extremity sent,) and of Judas' brother Simon in the latter; who routed the enemy, rescued many that were already taken and reserved for a dreadful death, and brought the survivors into Judea, a place of greater safety for them. In the absence of Judas, a band of Jews sallied forth from Jerusalem, thinking to do some valiant act, but it was unadvisedly, and against the directions of Judas; and 2,000 of them perished.* Thus while the children of Israel were falling "by the sword, and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, many days," they received help. But as yet, it was comparatively "little help." They were still exposed to the attacks of a strong and numerous army. There was yet, even in the city itself, in the fortress on Mount Zion, the Syrian garrison of soldiers, who constantly annoyed the people, and often slew them. There were apostate Jews who hastened to the court of Antioch, and earnestly urged more decisive measures against the growing power and success of Judas. It added to their troubles that many joined the band of Judas, with only flattering words—with insincere professions of loyalty, and perhaps some with intentions to betray the cause they espoused. It is mentioned that after Judas had fought two battles victoriously, and was about to attack the host of Nicanor, "they that were fearful and distrusted the justice of God, fled, and conveyed themselves away," 2 Macc. 8: 13. There were those also who are spoken of as having "revolted from him," 1 Macc. 7: 24.

These severe trials into which the godly of the nation fell, and through which all who were spared suffered everything but death itself, were ordained for a season as the trials of their faith, which would at last be found unto praise, and

* For these instances, see 1 Macc. ch. v.

honor, and glory, Comp. 1 Peter 1: 6, 7. An end should come to their calamities. There was a time set for it, and it should now begin to be hastened by the removal of that king, under whose despotic power they had been compelled thus to suffer.*

36 And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods; and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done.

---

* Verses 31—35 have the sanction of so high an authority as Sir Isaac Newton for their application to the Roman empire. The particular reason assigned by him, and by Bishop Newton who follows him, is, the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, of their application to Antiochus Epiphanes; and among the chief instances cited, are the declarations, "they that understand among the people shall instruct many," and "they shall be holpen with a little help." But in the light of the facts presented, such a reason is seen to be without just foundation, and those very instances to have a most adequate and proper parallel in events in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. Sir Isaac's mode of interpretation is as follows:—The phrase translated "on his part," he says may signify *after him;* and he adduces the phrase in 11: 8, translated "more years than," which he says signifies *some years after* the king, etc. The word "arms," which means the military power of a kingdom, he says here denotes the *Roman Empire;* and the clause reads thus: "And after him arms, (i. e. the Romans,) shall stand up."

Now it is true that the preposition found in the phrase "on his part," does sometimes mean "after," but its meaning is always determined by the context. In 11: 8, as we have seen, it is far from requiring such a signification. In verse 31, the whole context is against it. (See the interpretation of verse 36.) In regard to the phrase "arms," it is found in this chapter *in connexion with the king or empire that employs them,* (see verse 15,) and therefore is not taken as the empire itself. It is the arms which a king or nation uses for attack or defence, and in verse 31, manifestly belong to the king already spoken of, and again mentioned in the phrase "on his part," or "at his command," the pronoun being used instead of the noun.

The angel here resumes the description of the personal exploits and character of the king, from which he had digressed to speak of the victims of his power. Some expositors apply vs. 36—39, to Papal Rome, and the remainder of the chapter to the Ottoman empire. Others apply vs. 31—35, to Papal Rome, and the remainder of the chapter to Napoleon Bonaparte. But if we are ever to obey the laws of language, and to be guided by the context, we are directed here, most explicitly, to Antiochus Epiphanes. "The king" has the definite article, which is never put in the Hebrew for the indefinite, but always marks some person or thing definite at least to the mind of the writer; and in such a context as this directs attention to what has already been made the subject of discourse. (2) In respect to the kings mentioned in this chapter, something is told of the termination of their reign; but unless the history of the king given in vs. 21—32, is resumed, it is left in the midst. The end of his predecessor is given, and the end of the one before that; but no end of the king, whose history is commenced in verse 21, occurs until the close of the chapter. It must therefore be the history of one and the same king. (3) Up to verse 36, the reader is brought no further down than the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Every one must feel the unexampled transition from the king of Syria to the Pope of Rome, or to Napoleon Bonaparte. From a temporal reign long before Christ, to the reign of Christ, there are indeed frequent instances of sudden transition, in the prophets, but not from one temporal reign in one country, to another in a distant country, with nothing to prepare the reader for the transition. From verse 2 to verse 3, in this chapter, there is an interval of more than a hundred years, but the absence of the article from the phrase "mighty king," and the specification of circumstances, leave no one in doubt whom the prophecy means. If, however, there should be something in the language of verses 36—45, making it impossible to apply it to the king, whose history is

given in the verses preceding, then it cannot be so applied. But if there is nothing, then all usage and authority require us to apply it to him. If the language is remarkably descriptive of him, then it is a confirmation that he alone is meant. No one acquainted with the history whether of the Pope, or of the Ottoman empire, or of Bonaparte, will fail to perceive that to neither of them does the language so literally apply as to Antiochus, nor can be applied to them throughout except by transcending historical truth.

The prophecy now proceeds to set forth the character of Antiochus in a more particular and comprehensive manner. The character given of him in this verse 36, has already been illustrated in the notes to the verses preceding. That he literally spake impious words against the god of heaven, is confirmedby the appellation of "blasphemer" given him in 2 Macc. 9: 28. It is remarked also in 1 Macc. 1: 24, on the occasion of the sedition of the deposed Jason, and the subsequent march of Antiochus to the city, that "when he had taken all away, he went into his own land, having spoken very proudly." The prediction, "shall magnify himself above every god," had its accomplishment in his abolishing the religious worship of whatever Deity he saw fit, whether of the Jews or of others, and in his setting up the worship of whom he chose. In his disposal of the Deities to be worshipped, he magnified himself above them all, as his inferiors. This verse therefore has its full accomplishment in Antiochus Epiphanes, though some profess to make the language a reason for not applying it to him.

37 Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of
women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above
38 all. But in his estate shall he honor the God of forces: and a god
whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver,
39 and with precious stones, and pleasant things. Thus shall he do
in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge *and* increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain.

By "the desire of women," is not meant licentious pleasures,—an interpretation which some have given, and found in it a reason for not applying it to one so infamously licentious as Antiochus Epiphanes; but it means the *delight* of women, (its frequent signification,) i. e. the object in which they delighted, viz. their idols Astarte and Anaïtis, which were assiduously worshipped by the women of Syria. The position of this phrase in the sentence, demands such an interpretation, and the original sanctions it. Compare also the explanation of the word "princes," in verse 8. These idols, together with those worshipped from ancient times by the men of Syria and the East, and honored by his fathers, he set aside for the introduction of the gods worshipped in Greece, particularly Jupiter Olympius, and Hercules, who is well denoted by the phrase "god of forces," i. e. the god of *strong holds*, (for the word translated "forces" is the same word with that translated in verses 7, 10, etc. as "*fortress*," only one is in the plural and the others are in the singular.) Hercules is the god whom, as we have seen, he honored in the games celebrated at Tyre. That Hercules was this "god of strong-holds," is the more probable from the fact, that the Grecian Hercules was of Phenician origin, and those cities of Greece which were originally Phenician colonies, celebrated feasts in honor of him, and sang his exploits, (See Article on Hercules in American Encyclopedia.) In Tyre therefore, which belonged to Phenicia, Antiochus doubtless found the worship of Hercules already existing; a worship remarkably fitted to suit such a person as Antiochus, and it was also Greek. Hercules is represented as brawny and muscular, with small head and spirited face, short thick neck, high chest, strong and brawny shoulders, with a lion's skin and a club.

"In his estate," does not denote in the reign of Antiochus, but in the *stead* of the god of his fathers; or the pronoun may be rendered *their*, and refer to the gods of his country in

general. "Pleasant things," are any costly, beautiful offerings whatsoever.

Verse 39, commencing with the second clause, may literally read as follows—Whosoever acknowledges him [i. e. "the god of strong holds,"] he will increase with honor, and cause them to have dominion over many, and distribute the land [among them] for [their] reward. The disposition to honor and reward such as complied with his humor, has already been sufficiently noticed. Antiochus, however, did not himself care for any god, (see verse 37,) but as law-giver and religion-giver, he would pull down and build up as he chose. The first clause of verse 39 seems to imply that Antiochus introduced the worship of Hercules, (the god whom his fathers acknowledged not,) into all the fortified places of Syria.

40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: [viz. at "the king," i. e. of the north:] and the king of the north shall come against him [viz. the king of the south] like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and pass over.

The angel now coming to the downfall of the Syrian, recapitulates and sums up the events immediately preceding it, with the addition of a few particulars. As we have already seen under verse 27, the young king of the south, Ptolemy VI, Philometer, had roused himself from his effeminacy, and adopted measures to repel Antiochus; and Antiochus had rushed again into Egypt with greater fury, See verse 29. While hastening to Alexandria against the two Ptolemies, he sent also a fleet to Cyprus, to secure that island as the key to Egypt.

41 He shall also enter into the glorious land, and many *countries* shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, *even* Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.

His invasion of Palestine subsequently to his repulse in Egypt, has been already noticed in verses 30—39. The word rendered "*countries*," though not in the original, is probably implied, as the adjective is feminine. While he ravaged almost every country in and around Palestine, history mentions no invasion and spoil of Moab, Edom, and the chief places of the Ammonites. An ancient commentor, Theodoret, who applies this passage to Antichrist, does indeed assert, that Antiochus "having overthrown these nations, constituted rulers over them, one of whom was Timotheus the commander of the Ammonites." But his only authority is 1 Macc. 5: 6, etc., and that gives him no support whatever. For the historian of the Maccabees only asserts, that when the nations round about heard that the sanctuary was renewed, they began to make common cause with Antiochus and to harass the Jews. The Ammonites, also, and the Edomites, came against them; but they were not under the rule of Antiochus, nor was Timotheus, the commander of the former, appointed by Antiochus. They were independent nations, and had their own commanders, and were the old enemies of the Jews.

42 He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the
43 land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians *shall be* at his steps.

The first clause is a repetition, for the sake of emphasis, of the declaration in the preceding verse, and introduces the affirmation respecting Egypt, the particulars of which have been given in notes to verse 28. It is not here asserted that Antiochus invaded and possessed Libya and Ethiopia, as some suppose, who would make it an impossible thing to apply the passage to Antiochus. It only asserts that the Libyans and Ethiopians, who were held as slaves in Egypt, ceased to be the slaves of Ptolemy, and became the attendants and servants of Antiochus.

44 But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many.

He had returned to Antioch, as already related, from his last expedition into Egypt, and to console himself for his failure in that, was carrying forward his project to conform all parts of his empire to one standard of worship and laws. With characteristic recklessness, and devotedness to pleasure, notwithstanding the condition of his kingdom, he was celebrating games in the neighboring grove of Daphne, in honor of Jupiter Olympius, when he heard at that place of two signal defeats of his armies by Judas Maccabeus. The effect of this news on Antiochus, with accompanying events illustrative of this verse, are related in part by the author of the first book of the Maccabees, 3: 27—37, "Now when king Antiochus heard these things, he was full of indignation: wherefore he sent and gathered together all the forces of his realm, even a very strong army. He opened also his treasure, and gave his soldiers pay for a year, commanding them to be ready whensoever he should need them. Nevertheless, when he saw that the money of his treasures failed, and that the tributes in the country were small, because of the dissension and plague he had brought upon the land, in taking away the laws which had been of old time; he feared that he should not be able to bear the charges any longer, nor to have such gifts to give so liberally as he did before: for he had abounded above the kings that were before him. Wherefore being greatly perplexed in his mind, he determined to go into Persia, there to take the tributes of the countries, and to gather much money. So he left Lysias, a nobleman, and one of the blood royal, to oversee the affairs of the king from the river Euphrates to the border of Egypt: and to bring up his son Antiochus until he came again. Moreover he delivered unto him the half of his forces, and the elephants, and gave him charge of all things he would have done, as also concerning them that

dwelt in Juda and Jerusalem: that he should send an army against them, to destroy and root out the strength of Israel, and the remnant of Jerusalem, and to take away their memorial from that place; and that he should place strangers in all their quarters, and divide their land by lot. [Compare verse 39.] So the king took the half of the forces that remained, and departed from Antioch, his royal city, the hundred forty and seventh year [166 B. C.]; and having passed the river Euphrates, he went through the high countries." This discontinuance of tribute money from his eastern provinces of Persia and Media, together with the revolt of Artaxias king of Armenia which lay to the north-east of Antioch, (the "high countries,") were the tidings out of the east and north, which troubled him; and the fear and perplexity it produced, with a treasury exhausted by his extravagant expenses and lavish gifts, lest through failure of means to subdue the Jews, he should be thwarted even in this desire of his heart, as he had been in Egypt, goaded him to desperation, and he went forth resolving to make those eastern and northern countries an example of his severity for the trouble they caused him. Tacitus also speaks of this expedition of Antiochus, and confirms the facts already adduced. In his notice of the Jews, Book v. sec. viii., he says that "king Antiochus endeavored to root out their superstition, and introduce the customs of the Greeks; but he was hindered from making that most vile nation any better, by the war of the Parthians; for at that time Arsaces revolted."

45 And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palaces between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain: yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.

"The tabernacles of his palaces" may be the towers and fortress he caused to be built in the city of David,—the holy mountain of Zion,—between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, as though at this point he held fast the land from

shore to shore (see under verse 31); as though by possessing Jerusalem he kept in his hand the key to the whole territory, and could both hold the Jews in subjection, and resist the attempts of Egypt to get Palestine again into its power. Or the idea may be that of pitching his palace-tents on mount Zion, to signify his successful entrance, as leader of armies, into Jerusalem, and his establishment as Prince of the province, just as Alexander pitched his tents in Persepolis, and became master of Persia. With either interpretation, the verse does not present the event as taking place chronologically after those mentioned in the preceding verse; but it is a description to heighten the effect of the declaration of his end. All his strength, and glory, and dominion were now to depart; his hold on Palestine and on his numerous provinces, loosed; the ties by which he held the world fast to his embrace, forever sundered. Arrived in the East, he had made an incursion upon the city of Elymais, situated a little south of the border of Media, near the river Tigris, for the purpose of plundering a temple of Diana there, "a very rich temple, wherein were coverings of gold, and breastplates, and shields, which Alexander son of Philip had left there." It is supposed not to have been the same temple which Antiochus the Great, his father, attempted to plunder, and perished in the attempt. That was in the *province* of Elymais, this in the *city* Elymais. Antiochus Epiphanes was repulsed by the inhabitants, who assembled in alarm to protect their temple. He was preserved from a fate like his father's to perish more miserably. He effected a retreat to Ecbatana in Media. He here received intelligence, which only aggravated him the more—that his army in Judea had been routed; the heathen altars he had set up pulled down, and the desecrated temple purified, by Judas Maccabeus. In a paroxysm of rage, he immediately commenced his return to Syria, threatening "that he would come to Jerusalem and make it a common burying-place of the Jews." He commanded his charioteer

to drive on, with the utmost rapidity, stopping neither by day nor by night. His excitement and over exertion brought on him a disease of the most malignant kind (most probably the Asiatic cholera); yet he would not slacken his speed, until by some accident he was thrown out of his chariot with violence to the ground. Bruised and exhausted, he was taken upon a litter, and still borne forward on his journey; but even the motion of that was too painful to be endured, and he was compelled to stop at an obscure town called Tabae, on the confines of Persia and Babylonia, where his disease, increasing in virulence, became, in God's hands, a divine judgment, and he died 164 B. C., in the midst of anguish of body, exceeded only by his remorse. He came to his end, and there was none to help him—not though in his anguish he now humbled himself before that God, above whom he had once exalted himself—not though he said, "It is meet to be subject unto God, and that a man that is mortal should not proudly think of himself, as if he were God"—not though he "vowed also unto the Lord, that the holy city he would set at liberty, and the holy temple, which before he had spoiled, he would garnish with goodly gifts, and restore all the holy vessels with many more; yea, and that he would go through all the world that was inhabited, and declare the power of God." He found no place for repentance in the purposes of heaven as to the time and manner of his death, though he sought it carefully and with tears. "Thus the murderer and blasphemer, having suffered most grievously, as he entreated other men, so died he a miserable death in a strange country in the mountains," 1 Macc. vi. 2 Macc. ix.

NOTE.—Dr. Adam Clarke, who follows the interpretation of Bishop Newton on vs. 31—45, makes the following observation: "From the beginning of the chapter to the end of verse 30, all is very clear and plain, relative to the Grecian, Syrian, and Egyptian histories; from verse 31 to the end, the mode of interpretation is not so satisfactory

in its application to the times since Christ. Yet possibly these alone may be intended: though the whole might be, with considerable ease, applied to the remaining part of the Syrian and Egyptian history.

SECTION II.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAP. VIII.

THE DESECRATION, AND THE CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY.

It is manifest, on the perusal of this chapter, that it contains the substance of chap. xi. So do all interpreters regard it, however their views differ in respect to the meaning of them both. In 8: 1—8, 20—22, there is a full description of what is given only in an outline, in 11: 1—4; and there is given in 8: 9—12, 23—25, only an outline, quite enigmatical and brief, of what is presented with great fulness and particularity in 11: 21—45. One event is foretold in chap. 8: 14, which is not explicitly mentioned in chap. xi., though implied in vs. 33—35. It is the event of *the cleansing of the sanctuary*, which is made the chief proof-text by those who teach that the world will come to an end in 1843. The same event is also alluded to in chap. 12: 7, 11. But the interpretation of that chapter, though it is a continuation of the vision in chaps. x. and xi., is not needed to understand chap. viii. It itself needs the interpretation of the other chapters for its own explanation, because it seems to present in an outline a few things which are given elsewhere more fully; just as 11: 1—4 has a summary description of events foretold more fully in 8: 1—8, 20—22, though the predictions recorded in chap. xi. are on the whole an expansion of the prophecy in chap. viii., and contain the key to its most difficult passages. One portion of chap. viii. is easy to be understood,

and interpreters entirely agree as to the events designated. But on verses 9—14, and 23—25, there is much diversity of opinion. If the reader, as it is hoped, has accepted the results of the interpretation of chap. xi., he will come to the meaning of the more difficult parts of this chapter with much satisfaction and certainty.

1 In the third year of king Belshazzar, a vision appeared unto me, *even unto* me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.

Belshazzar began to reign about 555 B. C. He was the Nabonadius, or Nabonnid, of profane history, and reigned seventeen years. He is called Nebuchadnezzar's son, 5: 22. But as Evil-merodach succeeded Nebuchadnezzar, Jer. 52: 31, and as Jeremiah predicted that the nations of the earth, having served Nebuchadnezzar, his son, and his son's son, should then serve themselves of the king of Babylon, 27: 7, Belshazzar was doubtless son to Evil-merodach, although this fact is not expressly mentioned; and Nebuchadnezzar was called his father by the usage which often makes that appellation synonymous with ancestor. Evil-merodach was murdered in the second year of his reign by Neriglissar, his brother-in-law, who then ascended the throne, and died after a reign of four years. Laborosoarchad, Neriglissar's son, a minor, next succeeded, and after nine months was murdered by his nobles, who put Nabonnid, or Belshazzar, on the throne, with his mother Nitocris for queen regent, and Jeremiah's word was fulfilled in him as the last of the Babylonian kings, Comp. Dan. 5: 30, 31.

If the phrase "at the first," be taken as it is, it refers to the vision in chap. vii., as the first which Daniel had, and makes this the second. It may however mean, in the first year of his reign. The visions in chaps. vii, viii, precede in the order of time the events narrated in chap. v.

2 And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I *was* at Shushan *in* the palace, which *is* in the province of Elam; and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of Ulai.

Shushan was Susa, the winter residence of the Persian kings after Cyrus, as Ecbatana was their residence in summer, Esther 1: 2. Neh. 1: 1. Its received its name from the abundance of lilies that grew in the region. Ulai, (the ancient Ulaeus, or Choaspes, and modern Kerrah,) on which it was situated, was a stream emptying into the Tigris and Euphrates after their confluence. Elam, the province, was Elymais, so called doubtless from Elam, the son of Shem, (Gen. 10: 22,) who settled there. Shushan was its capital.

It would seem, from the structure of the verse, that Daniel was here in person, not by vision, as Ezekiel when at Babylon was by vision at Jerusalem. A comparison of Daniel with Ezek. 8: 3, and 40: 2, will show that the language in the two cases is quite different. And the two cases themselves are different; for when Ezekiel was by vision at Jerusalem, his vision particularly concerned that city; but Daniel's vision concerned Persia no more than Greece, and it concerned Jerusalem most of all; and therefore, under such circumstances, there is no propriety in saying that he was, by vision, at a palace in a Persian city. No particular significance is to be sought in his being at Elam; but he states where he was when he had the vision, just as John states that he was "in the isle that is called Patmos," when he had the visions of the Revelation.

Elam was probably at this time appended to the dominions of Belshazzar, and its capital made his occasional residence; and Daniel was either sent there on official business, or present with the king. But when Cyrus began to obtain possession of the territory round about Babylon, it was probably united to Persia, as indeed it was originally a Persian province, and with ancient writers, though not in the Scriptures, was the name for the whole of Persia. Comp. Jer. 49: 34—39, where the prophet asserts that Elam should be ravaged, [probably by Nebuchadnezzar,] and afterwards be delivered [probably by Cyrus.]

In modern Chuzistan, are the ruins of a city stretching twelve miles from one extremity to another. The largest pile is a mile in circumference, and one hundred feet high. Large blocks of marble covered with hieroglyphics, are often found. Here was doubtless the ancient Susa, and here is shown "Daniel's sepulchre," to this day. Josephus relates, that at Ecbatana, (it ought to be *Susa*,) Daniel built a marble tower of great beauty and skill, which remained, even so late as his day, in a state of perfect preservation, a place of sepulchre for the kings of Media, Persia, and Parthia, and its care entrusted to a Jewish priest.

3 Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold, there stood before the river a ram which had *two* horns: and the *two* horns *were* high, but one *was* higher than the other, and the higher came up last.

The expression "lifted up my eyes," shows that the prophet had this vision not in a dream, but awake. See also verse 17, and compare Num. 24: 34.

The ram, an emblem of strength and combativeness, is well chosen to represent the Medo-Persian empire. The horns fitly represent the two first kings, or race of kings—Darius the Mede, and Cyrus the Persian, (see on 11: 1,) the latter of whom, with the Persian race of kings, became more powerful than Darius, or the Median race of kings which ended in him. Cyrus towered higher than his predecessor, and the Persian race higher than the Median. It has been supposed by many, (and it is the only point of difference between commentators on verses 1—8,) that the horns designate kingdoms, not kings. Says Bishop Newton, "A horn in the style of Daniel doth not signify any particular king, but is an emblem of a kingdom,"* and in this he is followed by those who teach that the end of the world will be in 1843. Now there occurs in this very chapter, verse 21, a use of the word "horn" with the signification of king, viz. "The great horn

* Newton on the Prophecies, p. 248.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that is between his eyes is the first king." The word "king" is indeed sometimes synonymous both in common usage, and in the Scriptures, with *kingdom*. It is so used in this chapter, in the same verse where the phrase "first king" occurs, viz. "And the rough goat is the king of Graecia." But with this signification of kingdom in the phrase king of Graecia, it becomes the more clear that the word king in the phrase "first king," is to be taken literally. Bishop Newton himself, however inconsistently, admits this same meaning—for speaking of the "little horn," verse 9 below, he says, "The little horn did not typify a single person, but a succession of men, claiming such powers as are there specified." A succession of men is the *race* or *dynasty* of princes, not the nation itself—so do those in effect use the word, who deny that it means kings. As to the use of the word "horn" in the Scriptures, it is everywhere an emblem of power and glory, and when spoken of in connection with a nation, means the royal power, which was the glory of the nation, Ezek. 29: 21. Jer. 48: 25.

4 I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beast might stand before him, neither *was there any* that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great.

The Medo-Persian nation pushed its conquests westward as far as the Aegean sea, or Archipelago; northward into Armenia, Col-chis, Iberia and Scythia; and southward into Arabia, Egypt, and Libya It also made conquests in India on the east, but so inconsiderable as to be unworthy of particular notice. Its main strength was exercised toward the west, and north, and south; and it became the dominant empire of the world. Wherever it directed its energies, no nation could oppose effectual resistance, none had allies able to rescue them.

5 And as I was considering, behold an he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and

6 the he-goat *had* a notable horn between his eyes. And he came to
the ram that had *two* horns, which I had seen standing before the
7 river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power. And I saw him
come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against
him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was
no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to
the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could
deliver the ram out of his hand.

There was presented to the prophet, while he was considering what was the meaning, and what would be the issue of the vision, the emblem of a he-goat, (in the original, the he-goat of the goats, i. e. the leader of the flock,) denoting more impetuosity, and strength, and fleetness than the ram. The prophet is told, verse 21, that this goat represents the king (or kingdom) of Greece, and that the conspicuous horn between his eyes (the horn in that position indicating both sagacity and strength) represents the first king. It needs not language so explicit even as that of verse 21, to satisfy us that the Grecian empire under Alexander the Great is meant in vs. 5—7. His rapid marches in which he overran Asia in so short a time, his impetuous onsets, the fall of the Medo-Persian empire, and the destruction of the long race of kings springing from Darius and Cyrus, are graphically described. He started from Macedon early in the spring of 334 B. C. with an army of about 30,000 foot and 5000 horse, crossed the Hellespont into Asia, and had reached the river Granicus in Mysia, when a Persian army of 100,000 foot and 10,000 horse, (some say 20,000 foot and as many horse,) stood on the opposite bank to dispute the passage with him. He allowed his army no time to rest, but himself led on the right wing of his cavalry into the river, and though repulsed at first, effected a landing, followed by all his army with shoutings and trumpets. A close and severe battle was fought, which resulted in a signal victory on the side of the Greeks. He thence passed into Lydia, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, Phrygia and Cappadocia, subduing all to his sway; thence into Cilicia to a

pass in its eastern extremity near the city Issus, where in a plain bounded by mountains on one side, and by the sea on the other, and parted by a river running across it, he was met by the Persian army commanded by Darius in person. Alexander marched towards him at first slowly, until he came to the river, then with his right wing plunged in, and soon both armies were engaged hand to hand, with dreadful slaughter, some on this side of the river, and some on that side—the Persian cavalry having also crossed the river toward the Macedonians in the beginning of the engagement. Victory declared itself a second time on the side of Alexander, and Darius was one of the first to flee, first in his chariot, and then on horseback, throwing down bow, shield, and royal mantle. From Asia Minor, Alexander marched back into Syria, destroyed Tyre, entered and subdued Egypt, and also made the visit to Jerusalem mentioned under 11: 3, 4. In the spring of 331 B. C., he set out again for the conquest of Persia, crossed the Euphrates and Tigris, and met Darius with his forces not far from the city Arbela. Here in the year 330 B. C., in the month of October, just about two years after the battle of Issus, and at a place about as far east from that, as Issus was from the Granicus, a battle was fought more furious and bloody than the preceding, and terminated in the entire defeat of the Persians. Darius escaped, a fugitive with a few thousand followers. He had twice sued for peace, proposing to give up to Alexander all the territories between the Hellespont and the Euphrates; but Alexander insisted on entire submission, or a decision by battle, and in his last letter thus addressed him—"I attack neither prisoners nor women, but turn my rage against such only as are armed for the fight. Since Darius still continues by letters and by money to instigate my soldiers to betray me, and my friends to murder me, I therefore am determined to pursue him with the utmost vigor, and that not as an enemy, but a poisoner and an assas-

sin." The impetuosity and fury of the attack corresponded with the threats, and toward the close it could better be called a slaughter than a battle. The Persian cities, with their immense treasures, now lay open to Alexander. He forthwith entered Babylon, Susa, and Persepolis; in which last city, the capital of Persia, and richer than all the cities he had taken, when he had satiated his soldiers' appetite for plunder, he added the barbarity and the folly of burning the magnificent palace of Xerxes, himself leading the way with a lighted torch, and the Macedonians following his example. From Persepolis he started again in pursuit of Darius, but this unfortunate king was reserved for a more ignoble end than to fall into the hands of Alexander. Two of his generals had conspired against him to deliver him up, if necessary to preserve themselves against Alexander, or, if they should escape the hands of the Macedonians, destroy him and usurp his throne. At the approach of Alexander, they wished to hurry Darius along with them in flight; but he had discovered their designs, and refused. They immediately turned upon him with their spears, and left him in his chariot covered with mortal wounds. He breathed his last, just as the conquering monarch came up, and in him the Persian empire ended, having continued 206 years from the accession of Cyrus. Thus did the Macedonians under Alexander cast down and trample under foot the empire of Persia, and lay its horns of glory—its monarch, sceptre and throne—low in the dust.

The emblem of the ram with its *two* horns is preserved, because they stand for the two *races*, the twofold dynasty, of kings that had swayed the Medo-Persian sceptre, and because the first horn, Darius I, was *not broken off*, to give place to the second and higher, Cyrus; (comp. verse 8, and 7: 8, 20, 24;) but the two lines met together in Cambyses, the son of Cyrus and of the daughter of Darius I, and the two horns remained the emblems of the original two races of the Medo-Persian kings.

8 Therefore [Heb. And] the he-goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven.

After the conquest of Persia, Alexander marched into India. Returning, he made Babylon his capital, where embassadors came from all parts of the world, to present the homage and fealty of their respective nations, and he gave audience to them with all the majesty and pomp of the greatest monarch of the earth. But he gave himself up to luxury and excess, and soon perished. He died, no son of his succeeding, except to the name, but without the authority, of king, and that only for a very short season. The conspicuous horn was broken off, the race of kings destroyed, and others arose in its place. See further, in explanation of this verse, on 11: 3, 4. The four horns denote, like the two in 8: 3, and the one in 8: 5, four kings, or races of kings, viz. those between whom Alexander's empire was divided, as mentioned under 11: 4.

9 And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant *land*.

From Seleucus, one of those four horns, or from the race of the Seleucidae, descended Antiochus Epiphanes. The emblem of a "little horn," branching off from one of the great horns, well describes him, and his small beginnings, as younger son of Antiochus the Great, of the race of the Seleucidae; as hostage at Rome during the reign of his elder brother, Seleucus Philopator; as the illegal successor to his brother, while the son and heir of that brother was living; as the "vile person to whom they gave not the honor of the kingdom," but who "obtained it by flatteries;" as a monarch of comparative insignificance at first, because the resources of the Syrian empire were well nigh exhausted, and its territory circumscribed within narrow limits. The increase of

his power, and the extension of his kingdom over Egypt, over Armenia and Persia, and over Palestine "the pleasant land," (rather the *glorious* land, for it is the same word translated "glorious" in 11: 45,) are denoted by the growth of the little horn, and its extension toward the south, etc. as already illustrated under 11: 21—45.

It is objected by those who make horn synonymous with kingdom, that "Antiochus Epiphanes, instead of being another kingdom growing out of the Syrian government, was that horn or government itself." But this objection depends on an interpretation, which, as we have seen, is opposed by the usage of the chapter itself, and is not adhered to by those who make the objection. The explanation, which the writers above alluded to give of the little horn, will be seen to be forced, and altogether foreign from the mode of the prophet in other places. Says Bishop Newton, "Is it not more applicable to the Romans, who first subdued Macedon and Greece, the capital kingdom of the goat, and thence spread their conquests? When the Romans first got footing in Greece then they became a horn of the goat."* Others following him in the objection, but differing from him in the explanation, and calculating the end of the world in 1843, say that the little horn was the Papal power, which sprung out of the Greek empire as follows:—"Constantine the Roman emperor removed the seat of empire to Constantinople. After his death, the Roman empire was divided between his three sons—Constantius, who inherited the east, and the other two the west. The Greek kingdom had again become an independent government under Constantius, but on the death of his brothers, the whole empire came into his hands, and the Roman empire was again united. But A. D. 356, the Huns invaded the Roman empire, and between 356 and 483 there were nine other independent kingdoms within the

* Prophecies, p. 249.

Roman empire. But during all this time, the eastern or Greek empire, as it was called, remained entire and independent. In A. D. 534, the Greek emperor Justinian constituted the Bishop of Rome head of all the churches, and, 538, conquered Rome, and established the Pope in his see."* Thus the little horn sprung out of the great one.

As to the first explanation by Bishop Newton, the symbol would favor it somewhat, if it had been a little horn grafted (if such an expression may be used) upon one of the large ones, not growing out of it; or if this one of the great horns had been destroyed, and the little one had grown up in its place. Besides, Palestine lay toward the east; and if the prophet had meant to describe the conquests of the Roman empire, he would not have said both "toward the east," and "toward the pleasant land." Nor, if events must be taken in the order of the prophecy, would he have said toward the south, and toward the east; but toward the east and toward the south, because, as says the Bishop, they "first subdued Greece," or the east, "and thence spread their conquests."

As to the second explanation by those who find the Pope in the little horn, it is mere castle-building without materials taken from history. The subjects of Justinian were not called Greeks except by the Goths in reproach,† nor was the eastern empire called the Greek empire. It was *the Roman empire in the east;* and Justinian as *Roman* emperor appointed two of his creatures, Vigilius and Pelagius I, successively to the Papal see.‡ In 533, five years before he conquered Rome, (according to these writers,) he published as Roman emperor, his famous code of Roman laws called Pandects (universal code) or Institutes, for the regulation of the empire.

We see the impossibility of applying the little horn, whether to the Roman empire, or to the Papacy. We come back

* Litch's Address to the Clergy, pp. 78—80. Miller's Lectures, etc.
† Gibbon's Roman Empire, Vol. III. p. 97.
‡ Giesler's Church History, Vol. I. p. 341.

to Antiochus Epiphanes. If, in verse 21, an individual king, or race of kings, may be designated by the emblem of a horn, (and a writer on the latter hypothesis of the two above mentioned remarks that "all expositors are agreed that this text, [verse 21] points out the Macedonian kingdom, and the notable horn Alexander the Great,"*) then may an individual king, or race of kings, be designated by the little horn in verse 9; and if the events predicted agree in him, that little horn was Antiochus Epiphanes. Thus far in this verse, we have seen that they do agree. It will also appear, that all that is asserted of the little horn in this chapter, has been asserted in ch. xi, of one whom the context and laws of language allow to be no other than Antiochus Epiphanes; and if he is meant there, he must be meant here. It should confirm the conviction that the little horn is Antiochus Epiphanes, to learn that he is spoken of in 1 Macc. 1: 10, in a manner corresponding perfectly with Daniel,—"And there came out of them [i. e. out of "Alexander's servants who after his death put crowns upon themselves; so did their sons after them,"] a wicked root, Antiochus surnamed Epiphanes, son of Antiochus the king." And says even Bishop Newton, while he applies it not to Antiochus Epiphanes but to the Roman kingdom, "This *little horn* is by the generality of interpreters, both Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern, supposed to mean Antiochus Epiphanes. So Josephus understands it, and so Jerome explains it."†

10 And it waxed great, *even* to the host of heaven; and it cast down *some* of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped
11 upon them. Yea, he magnified *himself* even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily *sacrifice* was taken away, and the place
12 of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given *him* against the daily *sacrifice* by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered.

In illustration of verse 10, and the first clause of verse 11,

* Litch's Address, p. 76. † Prophecies, p. 247.

compare the following: "Thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also [even] upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High," Is. 14: 13, 14. "Thou, O Belshazzar, hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven; and they have brought the vessels of his house before thee, and thou, and thy lords, thy wives and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them; and thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know: and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified." Dan. 5: 22, 23. Also 2 Macc. 9: 8, 10,—most remarkably in point, as the historian is speaking of A. Epiphanes—"And thus he that a little afore thought he might command the waves of the sea, (so proud was he beyond the condition of man,) and weigh the high mountains in a balance, was now cast on the ground; and the man, that thought a little afore he could reach to the stars of heaven, no man could endure to carry for his intolerable stench."

The appellation "prince of the host," does not seem to be synonymous with the phrase "prince of the covenant," in 11: 22, though the word "host" seems to be figuratively used, at least in the middle clause, for the ministers and priests of the temple—the Jewish hierarchy—perhaps also for the *worshippers* in the temple. In verse 25, it is exchanged for "Prince of princes," and what is here asserted respecting "the prince of the host," is expressed in a parallel clause in 11: 36, "he shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods." It does not therefore here denote the high-priest, but Jehovah. Compare also the following: "As I live saith the King, whose name is the Lord of hosts." "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number." "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them," Jer. 46: 18.

Is. 40: 16. Gen. 2: 1. If the first clause of verse 11 denotes more than the utterance of words of blasphemy, (see the explanation of the corresponding clause in 11: 36,) it is to be taken in the sense that what is done against God's servants is done against himself—a principle expressed so forcibly in Zech. 2: 8, "He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye." Jerusalem, and the temple, and the Jews, were the city, and sanctuary, and people, of the Lord of hosts.

The phrase "by him," in the middle clause of verse 11, is *by it*, i. e. by the little horn, or the king it denotes. The phrase "place of his sanctuary," in the last clause of verse 11, means the place of the sanctuary of "the prince of the host," compare Is. 60: 13, 14, "The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, to beautify the place of my sanctuary, and they shall call thee Zion, the Holy One of Israel." The place of his sanctuary was Zion, "city of our God, the mountain of his holiness," Ps. 48: 1, 2. See further on verse 14.

The first clause of verse 12 literally reads, An host was set against the continual [burnt offering] by reason of transgression. "An host" often means an armed soldiery, and such is doubtless its significance here, the prophet passing from one meaning to the other, and perhaps using the word *host* of the little horn with some significance, as comparing it with the host of the king of heaven against whom the little horn thus magnified itself. Instead of "by reason of transgression," where the prophet would be made to suggest the great wickedness of the Jews as the reason of the invasion, it may read, *with* transgression—that is, an armed soldiery shall be sent to commit the great transgression of taking away the morning and evening sacrifices of the sanctuary. See further on verse 23.* The casting down of the truth

* There is one other interpretation which the first clause of v. 12 may literally have, though it indeed amounts to the same, viz. The host shall be given up, in addition to the sanctuary, to the transgression. That is, God's chosen people, including some of the brightest

to the ground, by the armed soldiery, or by him who sent them, was the overthrow of divine institutions, the prostration of God's holy religion, the abolition of his law. He who sent the army accomplished his purposes, ("practised," which is the same word in the original translated "shall deal," and "thus shall he do," in 11: 7, 17,) he prospered in his designs. How can language more appropriately describe, than do these verses, the towering ambition of Antiochus Epiphanes, his deeds against Jerusalem, against the temple, against the Jews, as already illustrated under 11: 22, 28, 30—36? Is it possible, in the light of these facts, not to find that Antiochus Epiphanes is the little horn here described? Is this prophecy in chap. viii. any more than the germ of the full prophecy in 11: 21—45? But even more light is to be given us in vs. 23—25, to enable us to discern who it is; and it will then be seen whether the remark has been made with any accuracy by Bishop Newton and others, (Prophecies p. 247,) that "Antiochus Epiphanes doth indeed in some features very much resemble the *little horn*, but upon a nearer view and examination it will evidently appear, that in other parts there is no manner of similitude or correspondence between them."

13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain *saint* which spake, How long *shall be* the vision *concerning* the daily *sacrifice*, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?

These saints, i. e. the holy ones, the angels of God, are in-

ornaments and highest rulers of the nation, shall be given up, along with the temple, into the hands of the transgressors their enemy. The word "transgression" may be used elliptically for *men of transgression*, or as the abstract for the concrete, (See Ezek. 2: 7, where the words "most rebellious" in our Translation, are in the Hebrew, *rebellion*, i. e. men of rebellion.) The sentiment of this first clause is found in the verses immediately preceding, and may be here repeated to give it emphasis, just as the first clause of v. 7 repeats the sentiment contained in v. 6.

troduced by a sort of scenic representation before the prophet, to make the whole more impressive. The "transgression of desolation," is the same substantially with "abomination of desolation," 11: 31, though it seems to have here a larger signification; and it rather confirms the interpretation given of the first clause of verse 12—"An host was set against the continual [burnt-offering] with transgression." The question "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice," is literally, How long the vision—viz. the continual [burnt-offering] and the transgression of desolation? (or desolating transgression?) Our translation expresses the sense, and the same sort of grammatical construction is found in other places.* It is, How long shall be the period in the vision, which covers the taking away of the daily sacrifice, and the giving up of the sanctuary and its worshippers to be trodden under foot? How long shall it be from the beginning to the end of the desolating transgression?

14 And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

The words "sanctuary," and "daily sacrifice," in verses 13, 14, must refer back to the words "sanctuary," and "daily sacrifice," in verses 11, 12, and designate the same things, and have the same meaning which those two words express in 11: 31, whatever be the events asserted respecting them. It is the same "sanctuary" which was to be "cast down," and "trodden under foot," that was also to "be cleansed." How is it possible to read this chapter, and not see and feel it must be so? What usage whether of Scripture or of common sense can be brought to justify the separation of these words in so close a connexion, and making sanctuary mean one thing in verses 11, 13, and another thing in verse 14? And yet this separation is made by those who teach the end of the world in A. D. 1843, and who make this passage the

* See Stuart's Heb. Gramm., Syntax, on Apposition.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

great proof-text to support their doctrine. These writers are divided as to the meaning of the word "sanctuary" in verse 11—some affirming that it means "Paganism's sanctuary,"* and others admitting, that it means "the Jewish sanctuary," while these last affirm, inconsistently enough, that in 11: 31, it means the city Rome.† But all of them take the word "sanctuary" in verse 14, in a different sense from that in vs. 11, 13, while they also differ from each other as to the meaning of the word in verse 14—some of them affirming that it means the Christian church,‡ and others that it means the earth.§

In respect to the meaning "Paganism's sanctuary," it has been sufficiently shown, under 11: 31, that it is impossible to make any such application of the word. And where was the place of Paganism's sanctuary? Was it Rome? Was it an abstract term for the Pagan system throughout the Roman empire? So the writer alluded to seems to consider it; for he says, "The place of Paganism's sanctuary was then cast down, and in its place a new system of idolatry was set up—viz. the worship of saints and images."‖ But who can fail to see that this is a construction harsh and unwarrantable to the last degree?

As to the meaning assigned by the writers above mentioned to "sanctuary" in verse 14, i. e. either "the Christian church," or "the earth;" it is said in support of the former, that the use of the word is supported by Heb. 8: 2, where our Lord Jesus Christ is called "a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Now this meaning cannot be applied to Dan. 8: 14, and the sentiment be, that at the end of 2300 years the true Christian church shall be cleansed. The true tabernacle and sanctuary in Heb. 8: 1, is the inner sanctuary of all true saints—it is the spiritual building of God, eternal in the hea-

* Litch's Address to the Clergy, p. 81.
† Miller's Lectures, pp. 40, 41.
‡ Litch, p. 83.
§ Miller, Fitch, etc.
‖ Litch, p. 81.

vens, and is called "true" in distinction from the earthly, temporary, and perishable. It is the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, Heb. 9: 11, and concerning it the sacred writer declares "the heavenly things themselves to be purified with better sacrifices," than the earthly; and he adds, that "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," Heb. 9: 23, 24. THE TRUE SANCTUARY IS ALREADY CLEANSED, in the sense in which that word is used in the epistle to the Hebrews, and it is a monstrous mistake to confound the two words together as used in Daniel and in Hebrews.

The only passage adduced in support of the interpretation, "the earth," is in Is. 60: 13, "The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious." Now to whom does Isaiah address this? It is to Zion, as the context shows, "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion,"—"and they shall call thee, The city of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel." Zion was God's holy hill, Ps. 2: 6. "The Lord of hosts dwelleth in mount Zion," Is. 8: 18. "The Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem," Is. 24: 23. The error in applying "sanctuary" in Is. 60: 13, to the earth, arose doubtless from confounding it with Is. 66: 1, "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool." But so the *sanctuary* is also called, 1 Chron. 28: 2, "As for me I had in my heart to build an house of rest for the ark of the covenant, and for the footstool of our God."

We come back then to what is asserted in verse 14, of the sanctuary—having seen, if anything in the world can be seen, that the word does not, and cannot, mean "the earth," or "the Christian church," in verse 14, nor in vs. 11, 13, and 11: 31, mean "the city Rome," or "Paganism's sanctuary," which was no sanctuary at all; but that it designates God's

holy temple in Jerusalem, and that alone. The place of God's sanctuary was to be cast down; the temple, and its ministers, and its worshippers, to be trodden under foot for 2300 days. At the expiration of that period, the sanctuary should be cleansed.

The 2300 days is, in the original, word for word, *evening morning two thousand and three hundred.* It is a manifest allusion to the evening and morning continual burnt-offering, which was to be taken away, and it also harmonizes with the Jewish mode of calling the evening and morning one day. So long were the predicted calamities to last, and at the expiration of this period "the sanctuary" should "be cleansed," or, as it is in the original, be *made right*, absolved from transgression, i. e. *be recovered from the desolating transgression;* the declaration doubtless looking back to the word "transgression," in the preceding verse. The sanctuary which had been desecrated, should be restored to its former state.

We have seen on 11: 32, that the sanctuary was recovered from the desolating transgression, and purified from its pollutions by Judas Maccabeus, in the year 148th of the Seleucidae, (B. C. 165,) the 9th month, Casleu, and 25th day of the month, (about December 15th—Casleu beginning in our November and ending about the 20th of our December.) From this point, then, must the 2300 days be reckoned back. Allowing 365 days to the year, we have a period of 6 years and 110 days; or allowing 360 days to the year, we have a period of 6 years and 140 days, which (reckoning the months alternately of 29 and 30 days,) reach back from the 25th of the month Casleu, in the 148th year of the Seleucidae, (165 B. C.) to the 142nd year of the Seleucidae, (171 B. C.) and the third of the month Elul, (about August 24th,) or the third of the month Ab (about the 24th of July).

148 Sel. era,
142 " "
6 years.

Casleu	25 days,	Casleu	25 days,
Marchesvan	29	Marchesvan	29
Tizri	30	Tizri	30
Elul (to the 3rd day)	26	Elul	29
	110 days.	Ab (to the 3rd day)	27
			140 days.

Now it has appeared under 11: 32, that sometime in the 142nd year of the Seleucidae, (171 B. C.) Menelaus, an apostate from the religion of his country, accompanied by an armed band, with the authority and sanction of Antiochus Epiphanes, seized the office of high priest; commenced his career by causing to be committed a sacrilege which was attended with the pollution of the sanctuary by blood; procured the death of the godly Onias, the lawful though deposed high priest; brought on a wide-spread and thorough apostasy of the Jews from their religion, and probably occasioned even the frequent suspension of the stated morning and evening sacrifice, inasmuch as the priests under the administration of his predecessor Jason had begun to despise the duties of the temple, and neglect the sacrifices. In these events, there is certainly adequate fulfilment of the prediction that "the sanctuary and the host," should "be trodden under foot." The prophecy in this chapter does not circumscribe the events by the entire and final taking away of the daily sacrifice; which did not occur until 168 B. C. But it speaks of injuries and oppressions in a manner which in the light of history we can perceive both includes that event, and more. Those injuries were of sufficient magnitude to make them an era from which to reckon, while as we shall see on chapters vii, and xii, there are given other dates, which specifically meet the final suspension of the daily sacrifice. In regard to the commencement of the desolating transgressions under Menelaus, though it be impossible to verify the exact date from history; it is

enough if history furnishes us with a year in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, in which those transgressions took place, and there is sufficient scope for the 2300 days between that year and the year in which the sanctuary was cleansed. And this is more than we have in many other specifications of time mentioned in the Bible—for instance the date of "three years" in the prediction of the ruin of Moab, Is. 16: 14.*. Commencing, then, with the desecration by Menelaus, in the 142nd year of the Seleucidae, (171 B. C.) we come down, at their expiration in the 148th year of the Seleucidae, (165 B. C.) to the event of the purification and dedication of the sanctuary by Judas Maccabeus. Then WAS the sanctuary cleansed, and the prophecy fulfilled.

Instead of the number 2300, some have divided it, considering it 2300 times of sacrifice; and as there were two sacrifices each day, they thus reckon it 1150 days. Their interpretation is as follows: The 1150 days, reckoning years as lunar years, (354 days to the year,) and adding an intercalary month for every three years, would be just three years and two months: or, omitting the intercalary month, would be just three years and three months. They consider this the exact period during which the daily sacrifice was taken away. For although they admit that Apollonius arrived at Jerusalem in the month of June, B. C. 168, (which could not have been but little short of six months, on the lowest calculation, and may have been between six and seven months, before the final act of desecration on the 25th of the month Casleu,) they suppose that circumstances required considerable interval of time before he effected the suppression of the daily sa-

* It is more, certainly, than those have, who fix on [illegible]r A. D. 508, as the time of the abolition of the pagan sacrifices, as we have seen under 11: 31; for, they have no authority in any history whatever for such a date. And yet one of them thus speaks—"It is not known precisely how long Antiochus Epiphanes oppressed the Jews. But if the period is 2300 literal days, those who thus apply it are bound to show a literal fulfilment."—*Litch*, p. 78.

crifice. Now the perusal of the history of the events as given in 1 Macc. 1: 29—40, and 2 Macc. 5: 24—26, is very far from making an impression that Apollonius was three or four months executing his mission to interrupt and cut off the temple worship. Such an interpretation has certainly but a small degree of probability in its favor. It is difficult, moreover, to reconcile the number 1150 with other specifications of time found in these prophecies, as will be seen on chap. xii. But the greatest objection is, that the text seems naturally to read 2300 periods of united morning and evening, and so most commentators and readers feel obliged to regard it.

Some interpreters, as Rosenmüller, disregard both the number 2300 and the 1150, as exact designations of time, and consider the 2300 as a definite put for an indefinite number. But as we shall see that the other numbers, indisputably many of them, are exact designations of time, why should it not be so also with the number 2300?

Instead of the period 2300 *days*, many suppose it to be 2300 *years*, and they call the days *prophetic* days—days being taken for years. But against this mode of interpretation it is to be observed, (1) that the phraseology in 8: 14, is different from any passage in the Bible where we find the word *days*. It reads indeed, that "the evening and the morning were the first day;" but nowhere, unless it be in this chapter, do we find the phrase "evenings and mornings" as the synonyme of the word *days*, and substituted in its place. If then any example could be found in Scripture, where days are reckoned as years, the peculiarity of 8: 14 is sufficient to exempt it from the rule. But (2) the authorities which are quoted from the Bible to sustain such a mode of reckoning, do not, when closely examined, give the least support to it whatever. One passage is Ezek. 4: 6, "I have appointed thee each day for a year." These days of Ezekiel are not *prophetic* days, in the sense in which many suppose; they

show no established mode of reckoning time, but they are *emblematic* days. The prophet was directed to lie so many days on his side, and was told that as many days as he should thus lie, just so many years should Israel and Judah be punished for their sins. Another passage is in Numbers 14: 34, "each day for a year." This too is *emblematic*. The spies had searched the land forty days, and Moses was commanded to say that as many days as the spies were searching the land, just so many years should the Israelites wander in the wilderness—"each day for a year." To make the cases parallel, and to have ground for applying either of the forecited passages to explain this in Daniel, it ought to be that Daniel was "considering" (verse 5) these things for 2300 days, and that as many days as he was considering them, so many years was the vision to be in its accomplishment.

Those who make the 2300 days so many *years*, are divided in their opinion as to when the years commence. Bishop Newton, followed by Dr. Adam Clarke and some others, date them from the rise of the he-goat—about 336 B. C.—which would make them reach down to about A. D. 2000—when according to them, Rome is to be destroyed, the Jews restored, and the millennial jubilee of universal holiness and peace ushered in. Others, commencing with the re-peopling of Jerusalem by Nehemiah 444 B. C., make them reach down to A. D. 1856. Mr. William Miller and those who adopt his calculations, commence with "the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem," (for their authority, and how much support it has, see the interpretation of chap. 9: 24—27,) and they fix the termination of the period in 1843, when, according to their assertion, this present earth shall be destroyed with fire, and the final judgment take place. We have seen how unauthorized and contradictory of sacred usage, is this last theory, which makes the cleansing of the sanctuary the destruction of the world. It may suffice further to say on all these calculations, that the passage reads,

"To how long a time extends the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the desolating transgression, that both the sanctuary and the host shall be trodden under foot?" The period must begin *with the giving of the sanctuary to be trodden under foot.* The disregard of what lies so obviously on the face of the passage, vitiates all the calculations in question.

If the "days" could be reckoned as years, then being reckoned from the "transgression to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot," they must reach down to about A. D. 2130, and the fulfilment of the declaration,—"then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,"—be sought in the deliverance of Jerusalem, "the place of his sanctuary," even now "trodden down of the Gentiles" (Luke 21: 24); in the restoration of the worship of the temple, not indeed with the rites of Moses, but with the simplicity of Christ; in the true elevation of the host, the lifting up of the Israel of God, no longer the rejecters of their Messiah, but at last brought in with the fulness of the Gentiles, Rom. 11: 25. That the Jews will become a Christian people, is indeed foretold in the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments, as plainly as anything ever written by inspired men. That they will even become again a nation in Palestine, where, being delivered out of the hand of their enemies, they may serve God without fear, in holiness and righteousness, seems an event alike demanded by the language of some of the plainest prophecies, and among the indications of God's providence. But such events can be supported here, only by considering the passage as *typical*, as indeed the ancient fathers considered that part which relates to Antiochus Epiphanes—making him *a type of Antichrist*—while they also applied the whole of it primarily to him. But there is no more authority to consider Antiochus Epiphanes, or the cleansing of the sanctuary, *typical*, than there is so to consider Nebuchadnezzar, and the seventy years captivity, and the restoration of temple worship after the return from Babylon. Anti-

ochus was a *type* indeed of all the great bad men and despots of his class; and in this sense every vile person is a *type* —a representative of his class.

15 And it came to pass, when I, *even* I, Daniel, had seen the vision,
and sought for the meaning, then behold, there stood before me as
16 the appearance of a man. And I heard a man's voice between
the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this *man*
to understand the vision.

While Daniel was seeking for the meaning of the vision, Gabriel appeared before him, not near, but at some little distance. Whether the angel who requests Gabriel to communicate the meaning of the vision to the prophet, was one of the holy ones mentioned in verse 13; whether it was, as the Jews suppose, Michael, mentioned in chap. x, and whether Gabriel was also the one who uttered the declaration contained in verse 14, may properly enough be taken in the affirmative, though of course there is only conjecture to support it.

17 So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid,
and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son
18 of man: for at the time of the end *shall be* the vision. Now as he
was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face toward
19 the ground: but he touched me and set me upright. And he said,
Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the
indignation: for at the time appointed the end *shall be*.

The phrase "upright" in verse 18, is the same in the original with "where I stood," in verse 17; except that in v. 18 it has the preposition *upon* before it, and reads literally, *caused me to stand upon where I stood.* The posture of Daniel when the angel drew near to him, and the phraseology in the last clause of v. 18, further shows, (if indeed so small a circumstance need again be noticed,) that this vision was seen by the prophet waking and not in a dream. The effect of the angel's approach was to cause him to fall to the ground

and stupefy him with awe, so that he became insensible in the midst of the angel's communication. But roused and lifted up by the angel, he again heard his words.

The declarations, "at the time of the end shall be the vision,"—"I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation; for at the time appointed the end shall be;"—seem to imply that this vision looks not only to the end of the calamities under Antiochus Epiphanes, but further; that the calamitous events here narrated are to be in the last period of those judgments of which the captivity itself was a part, and which would be succeeded by the times of the Messiah. See under 7: 27. 2: 44. 12: 1.

20 The ram which thou sawest having *two* horns *are* the kings of
21 Media and Persia. And the rough goat *is* the king of Grecia: and the great horn that *is* between his eyes *is* the first king.

See on vs. 3—7. The word Graecia is in the original *Javan*, who was the son of Japheth, and settled *Ionia*, (Gen. 10: 4,) the country of Homer, and a name designating the whole of Greece. The word "kings" in verse 20, and "king" in the first clause of verse 21, is an instance, as above mentioned, of king taken for *kingdom*. The epithet "rough," or shaggy, is added to describe more graphically Alexander's formidableness and strength. He is called the first king, because his predecessors had only Macedon; he was the first over the extended empire of the Greeks. Or the first king may denote the first in point of eminence and glory.

22 Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power.

It deserves to be noticed that the prophecy does not say expressly that the four horns symbolize four kingdoms, but it presents the events that correspond; it says that four kingdoms shall arise *out of the nation*, i. e. of which Alexander the great horn was the first king. Or the word "kingdoms"

may merely denote reigns, and have chief respect to the *kings* whose reigns are thus spoken of. Those reigns were not with the power and glory of Alexander's. See on 11: 4, and 8: 8.

23 And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up.

Here the "little horn" is exchanged for the word "*king*," under circumstances that leave us no liberty to suppose that *nation* is meant; and the interpretation of verses 3, 9, in which horn was considered emblematical not of a kingdom, but of a *king*, is confirmed. The portrait of a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, (literally, *versed in fraud*,) describes Antiochus still more graphically, as the epithet *rough* was used, the better to describe Alexander; and it remarkably corresponds with assertions in 11: 23, (first clause,) 24, 25, 27, 30, 44, etc. He stood at the height of his prosperity about 170 B. C., one hundred and thirty-one years from the division of the kingdom in 301 B. C. It was the latter time of the reign of the four horns. For from the year 170 B. C. to the overthrow of Syria, (see on 2: 44,) was only the space of 105 years; and Macedonia was added to the Roman empire 166 B. C., and Egypt, the last of them, fell not long after Syria. The declaration "when the transgressors are come to the full," looks back to verses 12, 13—"on account of transgression,"—"transgression of desolation,"—i. e. when the impiety of many of the Jews was as a cup running over, or, (if the idea conveyed by the phrase "*with* transgression," be the true one,) when the wickedness of those four nations was about reaching its height, and their latter time was fast running out. A similar expression is used by our Savior, "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers," Matt. 23: 32.

24 And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and

25 shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify *himself* in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

That he became potent not by his own inherent might, see on 11: 21, 23. It was even by the aid of apostate Israelites, that he succeeded in his designs upon that nation, 11: 30. His resources were those of cunning, and fraud, and flattery; by these he prevailed, as shown in the instances of his accession to the throne, and his conduct in the war with Ptolemy, and his proceedings against the Jews. Fraud prospered in his hand through his superior worldly policy and foresight, and enabled him to destroy wonderfully, though he was not in himself a truly mighty man.—"The mighty and the holy people," is in the original, literally, "the mighty and the people the saints." They seem to be distinguished—the "mighty" denoting other people beside the Israelites, and the Israelites designated as *the people the saints*. Comp. the declarations, Fear the Lord, ye his saints, Ps. 34: 9. Also 11: 17, 32, 33, and 12: 7. "The people the saints," may distinguish the true Israelites, the faithful to their religion, from the false. The "peace" by which he destroyed many, may denote the impunity, the safety to himself, with which he did it, and may have been the cause of his self-complacency ("shall magnify himself in his heart.)" Or it may denote the secure, unsuspecting condition in which those were on whom he came as a beast of prey springs on his unwary victim. The phrase "Prince of princes," is the same in effect with "prince of the host," and "God of gods," 8: 11, and 11: 36. Comp. 1 Tim. 6: 15.—The mode of Antiochus Epiphanes' death is here strongly given. There is no room for doubt in regard to the manner of his death, as there is respecting Antiochus the Great, 11: 19. He died not by poison, nor by the hands of others, but an unseen power smote him to the earth, 11: 45.

The "little horn" was "broken,"—his very *race* was destroyed, as was Alexander's, soon after his death; (see on 12: 1;) but the "great horn" whence he branched forth yet stood, and the descendants of Seleucus still sat upon the throne.

26 And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told *is* true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it *shall be* for many days.

"The evening and the morning" is the same phrase with that found in verse 14, and there translated "days," except that in verse 26 the article is used to show what evenings and mornings were meant. The vision may be thus named, because though other events are described besides the desecration of the temple etc., they are narrated chiefly as introductory to that. Many days were to elapse before that vision should come to pass; for the prophet had this vision in the year 553 B. C., and the series of desecrations of the temple commenced in 171 B. C.—a period of 382 years. Daniel is directed to shut up the vision, when he had recorded it, as a symbol that the words would be in effect sealed, until understood in the light of those times to which the vision related. But it was to be relied on, and should certainly come to pass.

27 And I Daniel fainted, and was sick *certain* days; afterwards I rose up, and did the king's business. And I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.

The effect of so exciting a scene, and of the announcement of such events yet to take place, after his native city and his countrymen had already suffered so much, was too great for the physical energies of the prophet, and his strength was utterly exhausted. He was hindered from attending to the king's business on which he came to Shushan, being for some days confined to his couch by great debility. But "none understood," [the matter,] none knew the cause of his sickness.

He communicated at that time the vision to no one. Possibly, though not most naturally, the last clause of the verse may mean, that when he recovered so as to be able to attend to the king's business, no one, to whom he communicated the vision, understood its meaning.

The interpretation thus given of the vision recorded in ch. viii, should not be dismissed without noticing the confirmation it receives from Josephus. "Daniel hath informed us," (says the Jewish historian, Antiq. B. x. ch. 11, sec. 7,) "that God interpreted the appearance of this vision after the following manner: He said that the ram signified the kingdoms of the Medes and Persians, and the horns those kings that were to reign in them; and that the last horn signified the last king, and that he should exceed all the kings in riches and glory: that the he-goat signified that one should come and reign from the Greeks, who should twice fight with the Persian, and overcome him in battle, and should receive his entire dominion: that by the great horn which sprang out of the forehead of the he-goat was meant the first king; and that the springing up of four horns upon its falling off, and the conversion of every one of them to the four quarters of the earth, signified the successors that should arise after the death of the first king, and the partition of the kingdom among them; and that they should be neither his children, nor of his kindred, that should reign over the habitable earth for many years; and that from among them should arise a certain king that should overcome our nation and their laws, and should take away their political government, and should spoil the temple, and forbid the sacrifices to be offered for three years' time. And indeed it so came to pass that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass."

In remarks preceding this quotation, in the same section, Josephus confounds events noticed in the vision recorded in

chaps. x, xi, and xii, with those of the vision in chap. viii; for he speaks of the phenomenon of Gabriel's appearance, and the flight of Daniel's companions, (10: 6, 7,) as happening when Daniel saw the visions of the ram, etc.; and that the higher horn (in chap. viii.) was the king who "should exceed all the kings in riches and glory," (11: 2.) He also says nothing of the 2300 days; but he speaks not only of the "three years," but also of the number "1296 days," as the period during which the little horn should "forbid the sacrifices to be offered,"—a period which he doubtless takes from 12: 11, viz. 1290 days—which will be explained in the proper place. But this only shows that the two visions, though twenty years apart, stood in the historian's mind as mainly one and the same—as indeed they are, with the exceptions mentioned in the introduction to the interpretation of this chapter.

SECTION III.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAP. VII.

THE FOUR BEASTS, THE LITTLE HORN OF THE FOURTH, AND THE REIGN OF THE SON OF MAN.

This chapter is an expansion of the prophecy contained in chap. ii. All commentators so regard it. Says Bishop Newton, "What was revealed unto Nebuchadnezzar in the second year of his reign concerning the four great empires of the world, was again revealed unto Daniel, (chap. vii,) with some enlargements and additions."* The study of this fuller vision, therefore, will more readily introduce us to the mean-

* Prophecies, p. 201.

ing of the events predicted, and prepare us to understand, more satisfactorily, the prophecy as recorded in chap. ii.

On comparing chap. vii. with those already examined—chaps. xi. and viii.—we see a resemblance in part, and we see also that chap. vii. contains the prediction of events not mentioned in the other two. The resemblance is between what is said of the second beast in chap. vii, and the ram in chap. viii, and the three kings of Persia in chap. xi; between what is said of the third beast in chap. vii, and the he-goat in chap. viii, and the mighty king in chap. xi; between what is said of the little horn in chap. vii, and the little horn in chap. viii, and the "vile person" in chap. xi. The things not mentioned in chaps. viii. and xi, which are found in chap. vii, are the first beast, and that kingdom, which, arising after the others symbolized by the four beasts, should never be destroyed. Respecting this fifth kingdom, commentators (with only one or two exceptions, which will be noticed in the proper place), are agreed that it is the kingdom of Christ; and this interpretation seems to compel the assent of the reader. But there is not so general agreement as to the fourth kingdom, and the object designated by the little horn. Most of the early christian writers, and some of the Jewish, considered the fourth kingdom to be the Roman, and the little horn to be literally and primarily Antichrist; though, as before observed, the early christian writers regarded the little horn in chap. viii, as literally and primarily Antiochus Epiphanes, and only a *type* of Antichrist. Bishop Newton, Adam Clarke, etc. and those who suppose the world will end in 1843, go along with the ancients in the interpretation of chap. vii, while feeling compelled to disregard the *typical* interpretation, they leave them on chaps. viii. and xi, and in the interpretation of chap. viii, and the latter part of chap. xi, throw Antiochus Epiphanes wholly out, as we have seen. Others among the moderns, who go along with the ancients on chaps. xi. and viii, leave them on chap. vii, and find the fourth king-

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

dom in that of Alexander's successors, particularly Syria and Egypt, and the little horn in Antiochus Epiphanes. While interpreters thus range under two classes, in respect to the meaning of the fourth kingdom in chap. vii, there is by no means perfect agreement in each class by itself, in the mode of explaining what is said of that fourth kingdom. In the midst of so much diversity, it may be presumptuous to feel any confidence in guiding the reader to satisfactory and sure results. But we come to this chapter now, with the help of chaps. xi. and viii, and with the almost universal assent of modern interpreters that the little horn is the same king, or the same dynasty of kings, both in chaps. vii. and viii; that they are the same exploits mentioned in chaps. 11: 31—36, in 8: 10—12, and in 7: 11, 21, 25. So affirm both classes of interpreters above mentioned, and they but affirm what it requires no uncommon sagacity to see to be the truth. If the reader, then, has accepted the results of the interpretation of chaps. xi. and viii, he has a clew to guide him through this more difficult prophecy; and coming from the plain to the more obscure, from the more expanded vision of the little horn, and the kingdom with which it was connected, to this more sententious and enigmatical, he will, even though not all obscurity be removed, (as it is hoped it will be,) attain to a satisfactory conclusion in regard to the meaning of chap. vii.

1 In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon, Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, *and* told the sum of the matters.

See on 8: 1. The use of the third person when a prophet speaks of himself, is quite common, Comp. 10: 1. Is. 18: 1—4. Rev. 1: 1, 2. The visions which he now had, and the summary (or, as it is in the original, heads) of which he relates, were not when he was awake and standing, as in chap. viii, but in a dream and on his couch.

2 Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea.

"The great sea" was the Mediterranean, which lies behind Palestine on the west, and was so called from the lesser seas, or lakes, such as the Salt (or Dead) Sea, Gen. 14: 3, and the Sea of Galilee or Tiberias, John 6: 1. The rushing forth of the four winds of heaven together on the sea, is emblematic of civil commotions and revolutions. The Mediterranean is chosen as the place of scene, because it was a fit emblem, from its greatness, of the events that were to happen.

3 And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from
4 another. The first *was* like a lion, and had eagles' wings; I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it.

While the hurricanes and whirlwinds were raging on the great sea, these four emblematic beasts rose in succession as to fit music; they were born in the midst of wars and commotions.* The explanation is given in verse 17, that these four great beasts represent four kings, or *kingdoms;* the word "king" being here used by metonyme for *kingdom*, as in 8: 21. See also 7: 23, "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth."

* Such fabulous monsters as the lion with two wings, and the leopard with four wings and four heads, were not unusual emblems among the ancient nations, and they have some kindred with the modern heraldry. It is said that winged lions have been found among the ruins of Persepolis. There is also the Egyptian *sphinx*, a creature with a female human head on the body of a lion, always crouched down, with its fore paws stretching forward. One of these statues has been removed to Paris, and is twenty-two feet long, made out of a block of red granite. Another, near Gizeh, recently uncovered from the sands in which it was embedded, is about 150 feet long and sixty-three feet high—the body is made out of one block of stone; the paws, which are extended fifty feet in front, are made of masonry. The metaphorical designation of lions, eagles, leopards, and bears is often applied in the Bible to the nations that oppressed Jerusalem, Jer. 5: 6. Ezek. 17: 3, etc.

Without question, the first kingdom was the Chaldean. This monarchy had its origin in revolutions, and grew great by wars and conquests and spoil. It first sprung out of the Assyrian empire, which had existed about 1300 years, when its unity was broken about 747 B. C., and it became two kingdoms—one under Arbaces, or Tiglath-Pileser, (2 Kings 16: 7,) whose capital was Nineveh, and who was called the king of Assyria; the other under Belesus or Nabonassar, (supposed by many to be the Baladan mentioned in 2 Kings 20: 12,) who had Babylon, and was called the king of Babylon, or Chaldea. An earlier Assyrian king is mentioned in the Scriptures—Pul—about 770 B. C.; but it was before the division of the kingdom. In 680 B. C., Assyria under Esarhaddon, (2 Kings 19: 37,) the third in descent and succession from Tiglath-Pileser, seized Babylon during an interregnum, and re-united Assyria and Chaldea. In 626 B. C., Nabopolassar, a general in the Assyrian army, seized Babylon, erected his throne there as king of Babylon, and the unity of the Assyrian kingdom was again broken. In 612 B. C., Nabopolassar entered into an alliance with Astyages king of Media, (father of Darius I,) and destroyed Nineveh, and thus again united the Assyrian and Chaldean empires; Babylon being the metropolis, with Syria and Judea among its provinces.* In 610 B. C., Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, jealous of the consolidated power of Nabopolassar, waged war against him, proceeded as far as Carchemish on the Euphrates, one third the way between Damascus of Syria, and Babylon, obtained a victory over the Assyrian army, and returning through Judea, made it tributary. Nabopolassar rallied his forces, and having associ-

* According to Robinson in Calmet, and Encyc. Amer., it was Astyages, (or Cyaxares I,) who sought the help of Nabopolassar against Nineveh, and Assyria became a Median province, Art. Media, p. 667. For as graphic and sublime a picture as pen has ever painted, see the prophet Nahum's description of the ruin of Nineveh, chaps. 1—3.

ated his son Nebuchadnezzar with him in the sovereignty, sent him to recover the losses recently sustained. Nebuchadnezzar was successful, and after an absence of about two years, was suddenly called home by the death of his father. He became the most powerful monarch of his times. Under him, as well in his subsequent reign, as in his previous command of the army, the empire showed the strength and courage of the lion, and advanced to dominion with the swift and far flight of the eagle. Tributary to it were not only Judah and Syria, but also Tyre, Sidon, Arabia and Egypt. The prophet Habakkuk thus describes it, 1: 6—8, "Lo I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation, which shall march through the breadth of the land, to possess the dwelling places that are not theirs. They are terrible and dreadful: their judgment, and their dignity shall proceed of themselves. Their horses also are swifter than the leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves: and their horsemen shall come from far; they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat." Under Nebuchadnezzar's successors, the empire began to decline. Its "wings were plucked," its power to make far conquests gone; and it was deprived of its richest provinces. It "was lifted up from the earth"—this lion, once so furious, became enervated, grew tame, and could now be handled.* "A man's heart was given to it"—its wild, furious disposition had departed, it was no longer the king of the beasts of prey, but timid, Comp. Ps. 9: 20, "Put them in fear, O Lord; that the nations may know themselves to be but men." Chaldea was no longer the invading, conquering nation it once was, but became luxurious and in-

* Bishop Newton assigns to the verb "lifted up," the meaning *taken away from the earth*. But this the word will not bear. It is the same word found in 4: 34—"lifted up mine eyes." There is also the marginal reading in our Bibles, "The wings thereof were plucked *wherewith* it was lifted up"—i. e. on its career of conquests. But this is unsupported in the original.

active, and afraid to meet its foes, until at last the nation shut itself up within the walls of Babylon against the Medo-Persian army under Cyrus. And here, while its monarch and a thousand of its nobles were revelling in the palace at a banquet, (chap. v,) and the nation was secure, not in the consciousness of valor, but only in the strength of their walls, and the abundance of their provisions, Babylon was entered at dead of night by the well-known expedient of turning the Euphrates, which ran through the city, out of its course, and marching up the bed of the river into the city.

Possibly the last clauses may mean, as some suppose, that Nebuchadnezzar, who once walked in pride, was afterwards abased by the King of heaven, chap. 4: 28—37; or that the Chaldeans, subdued by the Medes and Persians, became more gentle and humane. But these do not seem adequately to express the symbol.

5 And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and *it had* three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh.

The Medo-Persian empire is here well represented, by the bear, an animal strong, voracious, and savage. It was less noble and lofty than the Chaldean, as the bear is inferior to the lion. On the dissolution of the Assyrian empire in 747 B. C., Media, which had been a province of Assyria five hundred and twenty years, still remained so until it revolted from the king of Nineveh, 709 B. C., and under Dejoces became a distinct kingdom. But little is known of the circumstances under which Persia arose to independence; but it is supposed that having been a province of Assyria, it revolted as did Media, and became independent, and that Cambyses, the father of Cyrus, was its earliest king. The union of these two kingdoms has already been noticed under 11: 1. It took place after four kings, viz. Dejoces, Phraortes, Cyaxares I, and Cyaxares II, had sat on the throne of Media; and the

Medo-Persian nation, like the Chaldean, rose to its height amidst wars and commotions. The ancient historians speak of the cruelty of the Persians, as excessive and infamous. And the prophet Isaiah, in predicting their invasion of Babylon says, "Behold I will stir up the Medes against them. Their bows shall dash the young men to pieces; and they shall have no pity on the fruit of the womb; their eye shall not spare children," 13: 17, 18. Its posture, described in the phrase "lifted up itself on one side," or, as it may be translated, *stood up one side*, and its holding three ribs in its mouth, have the following facts in history to correspond with and explain them. Before Babylon was taken, Belshazzar, who felt his danger from Cyrus, went for aid to Croesus king of Lydia—the monarch so famous for his riches as to have occasioned the saying, "rich as Croesus." Having engaged Croesus to lead a large army against Cyrus, Belshazzar returned to Babylon. Croesus was defeated by the Medo-Persian army, driven back into Sardis, and finally compelled to surrender to Cyrus, 548 B. C., who then became master of Lydia and almost all Asia Minor. From the conquest of Lydia, he marched into Syria and Arabia, and thence to Upper Asia, and thence to Babylon, which having taken, he placed his uncle Cyaxares on its throne. There, then, the bear stood, in the realm of the Chaldeans, in Babylon as its first seat of power and metropolis, on ground which was *on one side* of Media and Persia, its original domain; and the three ribs in its mouth were the tokens of those countries which had fallen a victim to its voracity, viz. Babylon and Lydia on the west, Arabia on the south-west, and upper Asia on the north; Compare the vision in 8: 4, "I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward,"—the plundered countries lying in those three quarters being denoted by the "three ribs."

Some explain the posture of the bear as denoting that the Medes and Persians dwelt on one side, on the east of the

Babylonians; that the empire arose on the borders of Chaldea. Retaining somewhat of this idea, the symbol may further express the fact, that Cyrus and his successors made Susa of Persia, and Ecbatana of Media, alternately the seats of government; and the empire thus stood by one side of the ancient Babylonian, and made its conquests westward into Babylon, Asia Minor and Syria, northward into Armenia, and southward into Egypt—the latter being spoiled by Cambyses, son of Cyrus, as noticed under 11: 8. Most explain the three ribs as denoting Lydia, Babylon and Egypt. But the Medo-Persian nation did not confine its depredations to those three nations. Another explanation still of the three ribs is given—that they denote the three nations of Media, Persia and Babylonia, which Cyrus and his successors obtained. But this last does not adequately express the symbol, because Media and Persia were properly the beast itself, not two of the ribs in the beast's mouth:—The phrase "and they said," is often used simply for *it was said*, i. e. such was its commission, such was the work it was to do.

6 After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it.

The leopard, a nobler animal than the bear, inferior to the lion in stature and strength, but beautiful, active, vigorous, fierce, and not afraid to attack the king of beasts, is a remarkably appropriate emblem of the Greek empire under Alexander. Some have found a correspondence of the *spots* of the leopard, in the motley nations of which the empire was composed; others in the diverse dispositions of Alexander, at times merciful and then cruel, temperate and drunken, self-possessed and hurried away by passion. But it would seem as wise to find something to answer to the sleek skin of the leopard, as to the spots. The four wings on the back in-

dicate remarkable speed of conquest—double of that which characterized the empire of Babylon, 8: 5.

The four heads seem to correspond with the four wings, and belong, as do the wings, to the empire under Alexander. As the symbol of the leopard corresponds to that of the he-goat with the conspicuous horn, which without question was intended to designate Alexander's kingdom, so must we seek for the four heads in Alexander's kingdom alone, before it was divided. We are not to consider them separate from him any more than the four wings; and the four wings indisputably denote Alexander's rapid conquests, not the conquests of his successors. The heads, then, may denote the four main divisions of his army under the four generals Ptolemy, Seleucus, Philip and Antigonus; or more probably the four principal heads of his empire, viz. Greece, Egypt, Syria and Persia, Comp. Rev. 17: 9, "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth."

From some resemblance between this symbol, and that of the four horns which arose in the place of the conspicuous horn of the he-goat, most interpreters have pronounced the two symbols one and the same. But the difference is greater than the resemblance. The four horns arose not until after the great horn was broken; but here is the one beast unchanged in any part. Besides, if the four heads are the same with the four horns; if they denote those who reigned over his empire after his death, then what in the emblem of the leopard denotes Alexander? Take away the four heads, which some so confidently affirm represents Alexander's successors, then there is nothing to represent Alexander, but *a beast without a head.* There can be no consistent interpretation of this emblem except one which makes it represent the Greek Empire under Alexander alone, or one which leaving out Alexander entirely, makes it represent the kingdom under Alexander's generals, after his death. But this

last being most manifestly incorrect, the former must be adopted.

Macedonia, like the kingdoms symbolized by the lion and the bear, arose, as well as advanced to universal dominion, in the midst of wars and revolutions. It had been tributary for a long time to the Illyrians, Thracians and Persians, and had been obliged to give up all its harbors to the Athenians, until Philip, Alexander's father, ascending the throne at the age of twenty-two, B. C. 361, freed it from its enemies, partly by concessions, partly by force of arms. He sought to extend his dominion over all Greece, which was then distracted by intestine broils, and finally accomplished his object in the battle of Cheronea, B. C. 338. He assembled at Corinth deputies from all the Grecian states, and dictated terms of peace which deprived them of freedom. When he was just about to be chosen commander-in-chief of an army which was to march against Persia, he was assassinated, in the 47th year of his age, by Pausanias, a young Macedonian, who was hired to commit the deed by the Persians. He was succeeded by Alexander, who received the appointment of commander-in-chief in place of his father, and at the head of all the states of Greece, Lacedemon excepted, entered Asia, and by an uninterrupted series of victories for ten successive years, made Macedonia the mistress of half the world.*

7 After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it; and it *was* diverse from all the beasts that
8 *were* before it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and behold, in this horn *were* eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.
9 I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment *was* white as snow, and the hair of

* American Encyclopedia, Arts. Macedon, and Philip.

his head like the pure wool: his throne *was like* the fiery flame,
10 *and* his wheels *as* burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came
forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him,
and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judg-
11 ment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then because
of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld
even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to
12 the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had
their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a
season and time.
13 I saw in the night visions, and behold, *one* like the Son of man
came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days,
14 and they brought him near before him. And there was given him
dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and
languages, should serve him: his dominion *is* an everlasting do-
minion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, *that* which
shall not be destroyed.
15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of *my* body, and
16 the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them
that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me,
17 and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great
beasts which are four, *are* four kings, *which* shall arise out of the
18 earth. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom,
and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.
19 Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was di-
verse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth *were of*
iron, and his nails *of* brass; *which* devoured, brake in pieces, and
20 stamped the residue with his feet; and of the ten horns that *were*
in his head, and *of* the other which came up, and before whom
three fell; even *of* that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake
21 very great things, whose look *was* more stout than his fellows. I
beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed
22 against them: until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was
given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the
saints possessed the kingdom.
23 Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon
earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour
the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.
24 And the ten horns out of this kingdom *are* ten kings *that* shall
arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse
25 from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall
speak *great* words against the Most High, and shall wear out the

saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the
26 dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy *it* unto the end.
27 And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom *is* an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.

General Remarks on the Fourth Kingdom.

What is the kingdom denoted by the fourth beast? Who is the king, or what the race of kings, denoted by the little horn? In two chapters already explained, where the laws of interpretation seem to permit no other conclusion, we have seen that the dominion of Alexander's generals is introduced as directly succeeding that of Alexander; that the prophet enlarges on that dominion from the point where it is introduced to the end of the chapters. It is the dominion of "the kings of the north and of the south," and that of the four horns with a little horn growing out of one of them. As this monarchy is made to succeed Alexander's in those two chapters, and no mention even is made of any other except incidentally in two places; (where "a prince for his own behalf," 11: 18, viz. a Roman consul, came against Antiochus the Great, and where "the ships of Chittim," 11: 30, viz. the Roman embassadors, came against Antiochus Epiphanes;) as the prophet has given the kingdom of Alexander's generals the place of the fourth kingdom in those two chapters, especially in chap. xi, which all agree to be an expansion of the other prophecies respecting the kingdoms which were to precede the fifth; so must it be here.

(2) It has been already noticed in the introductory remarks to this chapter, that there is a remarkable resemblance between what is said of the little horn in verse 8 of this chapter, and the little horn in chap. viii, and the vile person in chap. xi; and that modern interpreters with one voice, however

widely they differ in other respects, pronounce the little horn in both chapters one and the same kingdom, or race of kings. If then the little horn in chap. vii, is the same with the little horn in chap. viii, we must seek for the fourth kingdom in that which was next after Alexander's, and for the little horn among the kings, or in the race of kings, between whom Alexander's empire was divided. If the interpretation already given to chaps. viii. and xi, can be relied on, the single question can only be now asked, Does the government mentioned in those two chapters as belonging to Alexander's generals, answer to the description here? It is hoped that it will be seen that it does, and that the correspondence leaves no room to seek for its application elsewhere.

The ten horns, and the little horn springing up after them.

The fourth beast had ten horns, among which another little horn sprang up, and before it three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots. The explanation is given in verse 24—"And the ten horns . . . . are ten kings," etc. This is explained by some* as follows—The ten kings are to be sought among those who had dominion over Palestine: and from various historical sources as Plutarch, Josephus, Diodorus Siculus and Justin, it is ascertained that ten kings of the government which succeeded Alexander's, had dominion over Palestine, viz. (1) Antigonus, (2) Demetrius Poliorcetes, (3) Ptolemy, son of Lagus, (4) Ptolemy Philadelphus, (5) Ptolemy Euergetes I, (6) Ptolemy Philopator, (7) Ptolemy Epiphanes, (8) Ptolemy Philometor, (9) Antiochus the Great, (10) Seleucus Philopator.

After all these rose up Antiochus Epiphanes, who succeeded Seleucus Philopator. He subdued three kings, viz. (1) Ptolemy Philometor, (2) Ptolemy Euergetes II, and (3) Artaxias king of Armenia. Those who adopt this interpre-

* Rosenmüller.

tation do not feel obliged to find the three kings among the ten kings, because in the interpretation by the angel as given in verse 24, "he shall subdue three kings," it seems to be left indefinite. But it is difficult not to feel that the three kings subdued are symbolized by three of the first ten horns, and that they must be sought among the ten kings, whom the ten horns designate. They are not to be found among the ten above selected, and therefore that interpretation seems inadequate, and is unsatisfactory. Moreover, Antiochus Epiphanes did not subdue Ptolemy Euergetes II. We have seen that this monarch was placed on the throne at Alexandria by the Alexandrians, after Ptolemy Philometor came into Antiochus' hands, and that Antiochus was unable to subdue Alexandria.

A somewhat more satisfactory method of reckoning up the ten kings, is adopted by others.* They find the ten in the dynasty established by Seleucus, (11: 5,) viz.

"1. Seleucus I. Nicator, founder of the dynasty, 312 B. C.
2. Antiochus I. Soter, ... from 279 B. C. to 260.
3. Antiochus II. Theos, ... " 260 " 245.
4. Seleucus II. Callinicus, . . . " 245 " 226.
5. Seleucus III. Ceraunus, . . . " 225 " 223.
6. Antiochus III. the Great, . . . " 223 " 187.
7. Seleucus IV. Philopator, . . . " 186 " 175.
8. Heliodorus,
9. Ptolemy IV. [VI?] Philomator, king of Egypt,
10. Demetrius I. Soter, son of Seleucus Philopator."

We have seen, on chap. 11: 21, that Heliodorus, and Ptolemy Philometor, were candidates for the crown, and that Demetrius was the lawful heir. These Antiochus Epiphanes displaced, having overcome them partly by fraud, and partly by the aid of others. But there are two objections to this, which certainly have some weight,—(1) that the scriptural usage does not make "king" synonymous with a mere aspi-

* See a valuable Article in the Christian (Baptist) Review for March 1842, "Remarks on the Book of Daniel."

rant for the kingly office, and such only was Heliodorus; for he had not succeeded in usurping the throne—he had not gained the object for which he murdered his master. (2) Demetrius afterward gained the Syrian throne, as will be noticed on 12: 1, and such a fact would hardly be consistent with the declaration, "plucked up by the roots." His being displaced temporarily by Antiochus, and that too when he was not in Syria to contend with his rival, but at Rome where he could only look on and see himself supplanted, falls short of the meaning and force of the emblem.

Others, following Grotius, make out a catalogue of kings, of which the last three are Seleucus Philopator, Demetrius, and Ptolemy Philopator—he must however mean P. Philometor; for P. Philopator died 205 B. C. while Antiochus the Great was on the throne of Syria. To this, besides what has already been urged against including Demetrius in the number, there seems the greater objection still, that all history is silent as to Antiochus Epiphanes having any agency in the death of his uncle. It was Heliodorus alone—who thought it a favorable opportunity to seize the kingdom in the absence both of Demetrius the son on his way to Rome, and of Antiochus the nephew on his return from Rome to Antioch. It may here be said too, in respect to Ptolemy Philometor, (and the same objection exists against the selection made by Rosenmüller, etc.) that he was subdued only for a season by A. Epiphanes, and that uniting with his brother, supported also by the Romans, he succeeded in driving Antiochus Epiphanes out of Egypt.

If no other solution can be presented, it would seem that we must rest content with leaving this among the prophecies too obscure to be satisfactorily explained in its every particular. The alternative in such a case need not be, that we must seek some other kingdom than that which succeeded Alexander's, and some other king beside A. Epiphanes, or the race whence he sprung. For as the obscure must be in-

terpreted by the plain, and as the prophecy of the little horn in chap. viii, and of the vile person 11: 21—45, must indisputably mean A. Epiphanes, so may we apply the little horn here in chap. vii. to him, even though it were not in our power to find at this remote period an event in history to correspond with every minute particular. But the following is presented as an adequate solution, after all, of this much vexed passage; and it will appear in the course of remarks on the chapter, that the passage has been no more vexed by those who apply it to A. Epiphanes and the kingdom which immediately succeeded Alexander's, than it has been, and is still, by the other class of interpreters who apply it to Rome and the Papal power.

The government denoted by this fourth beast, is that immediately succeeding Alexander's, and usurped by his officers, the principal of whom were the following: (1) Eumenes, (2) Perdiccas, (3) Antipater, (4) Leonnatus, (5) Craterus, (6) Neoptolemus, (7) Antigonus, (8) Demetrius son of Antigonus, whom his father associated with himself in his government, (9) Ptolemy, (10) Cassander, (11) Seleucus. It is certain that six of these wore the title of kings at least five years before the formal partition of the kingdom, 301 B. C. Plutarch,* speaking of the battle of Ipsus, B. C. 301, at which Lysimachus, Seleucus, Ptolemy, Cassander, Antigonus, and Demetrius were all there in person, uses such language as this: "that great battle of Ipsus where all the kings of the earth were engaged." At this period 301 B. C., the successors of Alexander were reduced to *six*; that same year, the *four* parted the empire among themselves; a little later, they were reduced to *two*. They were kings in reality, they had usurped the regal power, before they took the name; and it would seem not to admit of question that there were as many as ten of them reigning at some one pe-

* Vol. II. p. 250, Life of Pyrrhus, Harper's ed.

riod after Alexander's death, and earlier than 301 B. C. And there may have been this precise number ten, though history furnishes the names of only six. And even if there were more than ten kings reigning over Alexander's empire at one time, it is what those are compelled to find, as we shall see, who apply it to Rome. Alexander's officers usurping the regal power, they could be called kings by Scripture usage, as the usurper Smerdis was called king, see on 11: 2. There then the beast stood, with his ten horns existing all at once—shooting out and appearing on the head together. Those ten horns denoted ten kings, or *races* of kings, which began after Alexander's death, B. C. 324, although many of them were exterminated before 301 B. C., at which time only *four* horns existed.

Among those ten kings sprung up SELEUCUS I, on whom Babylon was conferred by Antipater, on a new distribution of the kingdom after that which took place in council on Alexander's death. History speaks of his "low beginning, from which he grew up at length to be the greatest of all Alexander's successors."* From Babylon he was compelled to flee, 315 B. C., to escape from the superior power of Antigonus, governor of Lycia, Pamphylia, etc., who had conceived the design of grasping the whole empire, and whose strength was so great that no power in the empire was then capable of resisting it. He took refuge in Egypt, then under Ptolemy I, and succeeded in getting Ptolemy, with Lysimachus and Cassander, to espouse his cause. They marched against Antigonus and his son Demetrius, and defeated them. After this Seleucus obtained of Ptolemy 1000 foot and 300 horse, and marched eastward to recover Babylon. "With so small a force," remarks Prideaux,† "did he undertake so great an enterprize, and succeeded in it." On his approach to the city he found the gates open to him, and he made a tri-

* Prideaux, Vol. I. p. 402. † Connexions Vol. 1. p. 402.

umphal entry, in the year B. C. 312; the people being rejoiced to have him reinstated in his former command. He thus sprung up *after* the others.

He also subdued three kings, three of the ten; three of Alexander's immediate successors, who are explicitly mentioned as kings, viz. Antigonus, Lysimachus, and Demetrius. Seleucus, being reinstated in his former command, grew more and more powerful, until in 305 B. C. he became master of Media, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Bactriana, Hyrcania, etc., and wore the name of king. Antigonus was still designing to suppress all the other successors of Alexander, and usurp the whole empire to himself. Seleucus on finishing a war against Sandrocottus an Indian prince, marched into Cappadocia against Antigonus, in the beginning of 301 B. C. Antigonus, being joined by his son Demetrius out of Greece, met Seleucus, with whom Lysimachus was then associated, near the city Ipsus in Phrygia, where a battle was fought and *Antigonus was slain.* He was plucked up out of the empire as the horn was plucked up out of the head of the beast. On the event of this battle the kingdom was divided, by agreement, between Seleucus, Lysimachus, Cassander and Ptolemy, and to Seleucus fell the greater part of Antigonus' dominions, viz. Syria, and many provinces in Asia Minor.

In the year 288 B. C., Demetrius who had escaped the fate of his father in the battle of Ipsus, and established himself in Greece, made preparations to recover his father's empire in Asia. He invaded Caria and Lycia, took many cities belonging to Lysimachus, entered Tarsus in Celicia, stormed the passes into Syria, which were guarded by Seleucus' soldiers, but at last was compelled to surrender himself to Seleucus, who caused him to be carried under strong guard to the Syrian Chersonesus near Laodicea in Phrygia, and there kept him a prisoner until he died, in the third year of his confinement. Demetrius was the *second* king, (being

crowned 306 B. C.,) whom Seleucus subdued and rooted out.

In 282 B. C., Seleucus marched into Asia Minor, and took Sardis, with the treasures laid up there by Lysimachus. The next year, Lysimachus, having gathered an army to repel this invasion, passed from Thrace over the Hellespont, came to a battle with Seleucus in Phrygia, where he was vanquished and slain. He was the *third* king subdued by Seleucus, and the dominions of all these three kings passed into the hands of their conqueror. He plucked them up by the roots and seized upon what was theirs; and history mentions no more among the successors of Alexander whom he subdued.* Here then is a perfect correspondence between this part of the emblem and the exploits of Seleucus I., who was the founder of the Syrian kingdom, the head of the race of the Seleucidae, from whom descended Antiochus Epiphanes. In him, and in that *race* of kings, and in their deeds, may we look for the little horn and all its deeds.

It has already appeared under 11: 6, and 8: 3, compared with 8: 7, that the word "king" is used either for an individual king, or for a *race* of kings; and this none indeed dispute. We have the usage of the prophet therefore in regarding the little horn in 7: 8, as the symbol of a *race* of kings, and the "king" in vs. 24—26 as synonymous with *race* of kings. If then we find some of the things asserted fulfilled in the founder of the race or dynasty, and some in one of his descendants, and the occupants of his throne, we meet every reasonable demand respecting the application of the prophecy. It should be considered also that this seventh chapter is the more enigmatical prophecy, and the vision in chap.

* He also subdued and killed in battle, Nicanor, governor of Media; but Nicanor is mentioned in history only as "governor of Media for Antigonus;" (Prideaux, Vol I. p. 402;) he did not rank with Seleucus, Ptolemy, etc., and he was sent against Seleucus by Antigonus.

viii. was designed to make that part of it more clear and definite, which, in the first announcement of the deeds of the little horn, was obscure. In making the second announcement, therefore, it was so expressed as to make it clear that certain deeds were to be performed by an individual king; and his own individuality, as well as his origin and race, was explicitly given. In the 7th, it was a little horn among many other horns, three of whom it would displace; in the 8th, it was a little horn off-shooting from one of four. And this very imagery of the four horns in chap. viii, one of them having a *branch*, further shows that the horns themselves were emblematical rather of *race*, or *stock*, than of individual kings, and that the *branch*—the off-shoot—was the emblem of an *individual* king. As in chap. viii, respecting the four horns, and the two horns, so here in chap. vii, respecting the little horn, (little when it first appeared among the others, but increasing afterwards,) the *race* of kings, and not an individual king, is to be sought as its correspondent.

It remains only to find what is said here of the deeds of the little horn and the doom of the beast, in the race and kingdom of Seleucus, etc., and it will be put beyond reasonable question, that the fourth kingdom in this prophecy was that which succeeded Alexander's—that into which his was broken, 11: 4—that which in chap. viii. is described as eventually four kingdoms standing up out of the nation—that which we shall see in chap. ii. to be denoted by the legs of iron, and feet part of iron and part of clay. The complex and manifold government of Alexander's successors, between whose hands the empire of the world shifted again and again, is well symbolized by this *unnamed* beast. But before proceeding to these particulars, it seems due to examine some of the reasons which have led so many to reject the application of this prophecy to the government of Alexander's successors, and to refer it to Rome and the papal power.

Reasons which have led many to reject the application of the vision concerning the fourth beast to the government of Alexander's successors.

(1) There is the fact that the kingdom of Alexander and that of his successors are often spoken of in history as one and the same. So Dionysius Halicarnassus, a Greek writer in the reign of Augustus, as quoted by Bishop Newton, p. 207, "the Persian was succeeded by the Macedonian, and the Macedonian by the Roman." So says Tacitus, B. v. Sec. 8, "While the east was in the power of the Assyrians, and the Medes and Persians, Judea was the most despicable of the provinces subject to them. After the Macedonians gained the ascendency, king Antiochus," etc. (See the remainder of the sentence under 11: 44.) So also do they seem to be contemplated as one in chap. viii, where the four horns grow up in the place of the one conspicuous horn, on the head of the goat, i. e. four *races* of kings succeed to the race of Alexander over the empire of the Macedonians.

But while they are considered one and the same, they are also presented as *distinct* kingdoms. In one point of view, they are the same, in another point of view they are separate. Thus in 11: 4, the kingdom of Alexander is represented as broken to pieces like a potter's vessel, and divided toward the four winds of heaven; as plucked up and given to others not of his posterity, nor of the race whence he sprung. Here is entirely another dynasty. Even in chap. viii, in the explanation of the vision concerning the great horn of the he-goat, and the four which arose in its place, language is used which contemplates the two as separate kingdoms. It reads that "four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation"—four stand up out of the one which had fallen and perished. And in the next verse (23) the phrase is used, "their kingdom," in distinction from Alexander's.

In 1 Macc. 1: 10, the era is introduced of "the kingdom of the Greeks." This era was that which commenced with the triumphal return of Seleucus to Babylon, 312 B. C., [311 years and 4 months,] and was called also the era of the Seleucidae. It was used in Syria for many years, and frequently by the Jews until the 15th century, and is by some Arabians to this day.* Now Alexander the Great began to reign 336 B. C.—twenty-four years previous. It is obvious therefore that in this era of the Seleucidae, or of the kingdom of the Greeks, their kingdom is contemplated as distinct from Alexander's.† Most certainly, therefore, Alexander's successors may be properly represented as still another beast, in harmony with what we see to have been one mode of contemplating their kingdom. Moreover, they got possession of his kingdom, as he had got possession of that of Cyrus and his successors, and Cyrus of the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar. Theirs succeeded to his, as his to the Persian, and the Persian to the Chaldean. The reason why their kingdom was sometimes contemplated as the *Macedonian*, as by Tacitus, was doubtless that his successors were principally Macedonian. Such was Seleucus I, son of Antiochus, and such was Ptolemy I, son of Lagus.

---

* Encyc. Americana, Art. Epoch.

† In Macc. 1: 5, 6, it is said that when Alexander "fell sick, and perceived that he should die, he called his servants, such as were honorable, and had been brought up with him from his youth, and parted his kingdom among them, while he was yet alive." Now that this does not mean that he made them his successors in the kingdom, is manifest from verses 8, 9, "And his servants bare rule every one in his place, and after his death they all put crowns on themselves, so did their sons after them many years." That rule was to be governors of the provinces, not kings, and it was to this rule he appointed them—the crowns they themselves seized. Comp. 11: 39, where it is said of Antiochus Epiphanes—"He shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain."

) Another reason* for rejecting the application of the vision concerning the fourth beast to the kingdom of Alexander's successors, has been the fact, that early writers both Jewish and Christian, and the great body of commentators in the Church, have considered this fourth kingdom to be the Roman. Says Jonathan Ben Uzziel, a Jew, who lived a little before our Savior—"The kingdom of Babylon shall not continue, nor exercise dominion over Israel; the kings of Media shall be slain, and the strong men of Greece shall not prosper; the Romans shall be blotted out, nor collect tribute from Jerusalem." Irenaeus, a Christian father of the second century, says respecting Antichrist, that he "is denoted by the little horn among the ten kings—the kings among whom the empire that now reigneth shall be divided." St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in the fourth century, says respecting Antichrist's coming in the latter times of the Roman empire—"We teach these things not of our own invention, but having learned them out of the divine Scriptures, and especially out of the prophecy of Daniel; even as Gabriel the archangel interpreted—the fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall exceed all the kingdoms; but that this is the empire of the *Romans*, ecclesiastical interpreters have delivered. For the first was the kingdom of the Assyrians; and the second was that of the Medes and Persians together; and after these, the third was that of the Macedonians, and the fourth kingdom is now that of the Romans." Next Jerome—"Therefore let us say what all ecclesiastical

* A reason on which Bishop Newton lays much stress. He quotes Mr. Mede, whom he pronounces "as able and consummate a judge as any in these matters," p. 192: "The Roman empire to be the fourth kingdom of Daniel, was believed by the church of Israel both before and in our Savior's time; received by the disciples of the apostles, and the whole Christian church for 300 years, without any known contradiction. And I confess, having so good ground in Scripture, it is with me little less than an article of faith."

writers have delivered, that in the latter days, when the empire of the Romans shall be destroyed, there will be ten kings, who shall divide it between them, and an eleventh shall arise, a little king, who shall subdue three of the ten kings, and the other seven shall submit their necks to the conqueror." And to mention no more, Augustine — "These four kingdoms some have expounded to be the Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian and Roman. How properly they have done that, those who are desirous of knowing, may read the presbyter Jerome's book upon Daniel, which is very accurately and learnedly written."—*Newton on the Prophecies*, pp. 195, 212—214.

Now we have seen that the current of interpretation for centuries from the earliest period, both among Jews and Christians, set towards Antiochus Epiphanes as the monarch primarily intended by the little horn in chap. viii, and the king, whose history is given in 11: 21—45. But this does not hinder those who appeal to the authority of the ancients on this chap. vii, from disclaiming that authority in other places where it is equally strong. And it should indeed lead us to be cautious of accepting the opinion of the fathers, except the *reasons* for it can be sustained, when we consider how the very best of them leaned on the authority of ecclesiastical writers that had preceded them; when we consider also how extravagant were their notions respecting Antichrist, who was designated as they supposed by the little horn. They asserted he would be a Jew, a descendant of the tribe of Dan; that he would come from Babylon, fix his residence in the temple at Jerusalem, first subdue Egypt and afterwards Libya and Ethiopia, which were the three horns plucked up before the little horn.* Those who speak of the au-

* Bishop Newton, p. 214. Some of the Jewish writers about the middle of the 12th century, as R. Aben Ezra, also regarded the fourth beast as the *Turkish* empire, which had taken Jerusalem, subdued Asia Minor, and filled the world with the terror of their arms, See

thority of ancient interpretation, would be more wise if they followed the fathers where the fathers were right, viz. in applying chaps. viii. and xi. *primarily to Antiochus Epiphanes*, and departed from them where the fathers were inconsistent with themselves, viz. in finding primarily in chap. vii. what they did not find primarily in chaps. viii. and xi. And yet it is this traditionary interpretation which to this day sways the minds of most,—that what by way of excellence have been called the four great kingdoms of the earth, viz. the Babylonian, the Persian, the Grecian and the Roman, were symbolized by the four beasts in the vision of Daniel.*

The great objection to considering the fourth kingdom to be the Roman is that which has already been dwelt on, viz. the Roman empire is not contemplated in chaps. viii. and xi, as succeeding the Macedonian. It is to be further said,—and it seems an insuperable objection,—that *the Romans never possessed the empire of Alexander*, their sceptre did not sway the countries in Asia once held by the kings of Assyria, Persia, and Greece, but the successors of Alexander, especially Seleucus, did. It is true that in a passage from an ancient writer already referred to, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, it is asserted that the Roman empire "ruleth over all the earth as far as it is inhabited, and commands all the sea and the ocean as far as navigable, being the first and only one of all the most celebrated kingdoms, to make the east and west the bounds of its empire." But as matter of fact, the Euphrates was the extreme eastern boundary of the Roman empire; and nations

---

Christian Review for March 1842, p. 28. The writer justly adds the remark, that it was *the circumstances of the times* that led to the adoption of the application to Rome, as well as to the Turks.

* Mr. *Litch*, one of the writers in favor of the theory of the end of the world in 1843, says, "that the four kings, or kingdoms, represented by the beasts were,—1. The Chaldean,—2. The Medo-Persian,—3. The Macedonian,—4. The Roman governments—is so universally acknowledged, that I shall not at all dwell on it," p. 60.

lying beyond that river, and constituting the central empire of the Babylonians, of the Medes and Persians, and then of the Greeks under Alexander, it never conquered. The empire was confined within limits on the East as recommended by Augustus to his successors, viz. the Euphrates; where for the whole of the first century they stood, and were broken over by Trajan in the second century only to confirm the wisdom of the advice of Augustus. For the conquests which he made in Armenia, Parthia, (including a part of Persia,) and Mesopotamia, could not be maintained, and the Roman garrisons were shortly withdrawn, on his death, which happened at Selinus in Cilicia, on his return to Italy. This extension of the empire beyond the Euphrates, though reaching but a very small portion of the dominions of Alexander and his predecessors in the East, was yet the greatest that ever acknowledged Roman sway.* Now let these facts be compared with the imagery in chap. viii, where the he-goat smites the ram, and the four horns rise up in his dominion, and the little horn waxes exceeding great *toward the East*, and in the light of that imagery let the language of chap. vii. be interpreted, and it must be felt that the limitation of the Roman empire within the Euphrates, and its small and temporary extension beyond, do not come up to the demands of the symbol. It did not succeed to the dominion of the Greeks, it did not subdue that dominion, as the Greeks subdued and succeeded to the dominion of the Persians, and these to that of the Chaldeans. The fourth beast, if Rome be meant, did not stand where the others had stood. Only the kingdom of the successors of Alexander, only the manifold dynasty that stood up in the place of his, answers to the nature of the symbol, and that kingdom with its kings must accordingly be designated by the fourth beast and its ten horns.

* Gibbon, Vol. I. pp. 1—5. Amer. Encyc., Articles Trajan and Parthia. Trajan indeed sent home glowing accounts, so that the Senate was absolutely astonished; but they were more glowing than the reality.

It was remarked above, that those who make the Roman empire the fourth beast, have vexed the passage as much as others, and are obliged to find more than ten kingdoms—they regarding the ten horns the emblems not of kings, nor races of kings, but of kingdoms. As reckoned by Sir Isaac Newton, they are "1. the kingdom of the Vandals and Alans in Spain and Africa; 2. of the Suevians in Spain; 3. of the Visigoths; 4. of the Alans in Gallia; 5. of the Burgundians; 6. of the Franks; 7. of the Britons; 8. of the Huns; 9. of the Lombards; 10. of Ravenna."

Mr. Mede reckons them up for the year after Rome was sacked by Genseric king of the Vandals, A. D. 456, as follows: "1. the Britons; 2. the Saxons in Britain; 3. the Franks; 4. the Burgundians; 5. the Wisigoths in the south of France and part of Spain; 6. the Sueves and Alans in Gallicia and Portugal; 7. the Vandals in Afric; 8. the Alemanes in Germany; 9. the Ostrogoths whom the Longobards succeeded, in Pannonia, and afterwards in Italy; 10. the Greeks in the residue of the empire."

Bishop Lloyd, a chronologist, gives the following list: "1. Huns in Hungary, who rose A. D. 356; 2. Ostrogoths in Moesia 377; 3. Wisigoths in Pannonia 378; 4. Franks in France 407; 5. Vandals in Africa 407; 6. Sueves and Alans in Gascoyne and Spain 407; 7. Burgundians in Burgundy 407; 8. Herules and Rugians in Italy 476; 9. Saxons in Britain 476; 10. Longobards in Germany 483, and in Hungary 526." This list was originally given by Machiavelli as ten kingdoms into which the incursions of the northern barbarians dismembered the empire.*

Bishop Newton makes out another list for the eighth century and he is followed by Dr. Scott and others, viz.: "1. the Senate of Rome; 2. the Greeks in Ravenna; 3. the Lombards in Lombardy; 4. the Huns in Hungary; 5. the Ale-

* This is followed by some of the writers on the end of the world in 1843, as *Litch*, p. 63.

manes in Germany; 6. the Franks in France; 7. the Burgundians in Burgundy; 8. the Goths in Spain; 9. the Britons; 10. the Saxons in Britain."

Now here are two, Mr. Mede and Bishop Lloyd, concerning the former of whom Bishop Newton quotes with approbation the remark of another—that "he was as a man divinely inspired for the interpretation of the prophecies"—and he was truly a learned and godly man—here are two who reckon up ten broken fragments of the Roman empire after its downfall, and each introduces three not reckoned by the other—the former, the Britons, Alemanes and Greeks; the latter, the Huns, Heruli and Longobards, or Lombards. Sir Isaac Newton has some not in Mr. Mede's list, and some not in Bishop Lloyd's.

It is manifest from the above comparison, that two learned writers together find more than ten kingdoms, though separately they find only ten, at the period of the dissolution of the Roman empire. Bishop Newton, who takes the kingdoms at a later date, remarks, "not that there were constantly *ten* kingdoms, they were sometimes more and sometimes fewer." And he might have made the admission that there is no proof that at the particular time of the rise of the Papacy, there were *exactly* ten; though he quotes Mr. Whiston as saying that "in A. D. 456" the number "was exactly *ten*," and Sir Isaac Newton, that "whatever was their number afterwards, they are still called the *ten kings* from their first number." The fact is, there is no proof that ten was their first number. Scarcely any two investigators of any one period agree together in finding ten alone, except Bishop Lloyd and Machiavelli, the former of whom follows the latter, and whose chief merit is that he adds dates which Machiavelli did not give.

There is as much difference in their mode of applying the three horns plucked up before the little one—the Pope. Mr.

Mede makes them the Greeks at Ravenna, the Lombards, and the Franks. Sir Isaac Newton makes them the exarchate of Ravenna, the kingdom of Lombardy, and the senate of Rome. Concerning the first of these, Bishop Newton justly remarks, p. 217, that "the Franks or Germans in Italy were not *extirpated, eradicated*, nor their dominions annexed to that of the popes." Concerning Sir Isaac Newton's catalogue of the three, he also justly remarks, that "the senate of Rome is not included in his catalogue of the ten kingdoms." Bishop Newton agrees here with Sir Isaac, but he includes the senate of Rome among the ten kingdoms, in which he differs considerably from Sir Isaac—reckoning four not found in Sir Isaac, viz. Senate of Rome, Alemanes in Germany, Goths in Spain, and Saxons; and omitting four found in Sir Isaac, viz. Vandals in Spain, Suevians in Spain, Visigoths, and Alans in Gallia. The application of the beast with ten horns to the Roman empire is beset then by no fewer difficulties and perplexities than is its application to the government of Alexander's successors; and if any, from the difficulties attending its application to the government of Alexander's successors, might be led to look for its application to Rome, they find the way no clearer nor straighter. So far, however, as difficulty has been felt in respect to finding what can be regarded as adequately answering to the ten horns and the little horn in the dynasty that succeeded Alexander, including that of the Seleucidae, it is hoped that such difficulty has been obviated by the last of the explanations there given. Having thus reviewed the reasons that have led many to apply this vision of the fourth beast and his ten horns to the kingdom of Rome, and to the ten kingdoms in which it was finally broken, (and who does not here feel also the harshness of considering both the beast a kingdom, and his horns kingdoms?) we come to consider more closely the particulars of the description of the beast as given in the vision. What-

ever other difficulties of importance have been felt in respect to its application to the government of Alexander's successors, it is hoped they will be removed as we pass along.

The more particular description of the Fourth Beast, and the Little Horn.

It was "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and break in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it." It was "exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass," and the angel said of it, "he shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces," vs. 7, 19, 23. The world never suffered more than, as we have already seen, under the reign of Alexander's successors, in their mutual contests for the supremacy both before and after the partition of the kingdom 301 B. C., and in their oppressive treatment of their provinces. In the long warfare between the kings of Syria and Egypt, and during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, Palestine, especially, was made the thoroughfare for armies, and often the scene of the most wanton spoliation and destruction. What can be more appropriate in describing the authors of all this ruin, than the image of the beast with *teeth of iron, and claws of brass*, tearing and devouring his prey? What can more fitly describe the conduct of Antiochus Epiphanes than a beast which destroyed what remained more than sufficient to satisfy its hunger, and rendered it unfit for others?—like the imagery in Ezek. 34: 18—"Seemeth it a small thing unto you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures? and to have drunk of the deep waters, but ye must foul the residue with your feet?" This kingdom was worse than the others, as the tyranny of many is worse than of one; and it lasted longer than Alexander's,

longer even than the Persian or the Chaldean. There is confirmation of the application of all this to the dynasty of Alexander's successors, in language used by the author of the first history of the Maccabees—who, when he had mentioned the fact of Alexander's servants putting crowns on themselves, and likewise their sons after them, adds—"*and evils were multiplied in the earth.*"

The monarchy was "diverse" from those which preceded it, in respect to its being not under one king, but under many who were often allied together as one over different divisions of one great kingdom. It was diverse in respect to its being strong and weak, united and divided, See on chap. ii. The little horn itself was diverse from the others in respect to its greater cruelty. While it was terrible to the whole earth, it was "exceedingly" so to the Jews, driving them in fear out of their land; compelling them to bow down to abominable idols, and to eat abominable meats; commissioning its armies to take away their memorial out of Jerusalem, and plant foreigners in their place, (1 Macc. 3: 35.) By no other kings whatever, by none of the other successors of Alexander, were they so treated. But to add no more, let the reader turn again to 11: 16, 23, 24, 26, etc., and 8: 23, 24, and re-peruse the facts adduced from authentic history in the interpretation of those verses, and he will judge for himself whether this description of the beast has not its fulfilment in the government of Alexander's successors, especially of the Seleucidae, and of Antiochus Epiphanes one of the Seleucidae. He will also judge for himself whether the assertion made by Bishop Newton and others, (Prophecies, p. 206,) that "the kingdoms of the Seleucidae and of the Lagidae can in no respect answer to this description of the fourth beast or kingdom," is any more accurate than the same assertion concerning 11: 31—35, (Interpr. p. 53,) and concerning 8: 9—12, (Interpr. p. 77.) It is strange that he should say, "instead of subduing other kingdoms, they tore to pieces their

own," that he should interpret the phrase "diverse from all kingdoms" as meaning only a different constitution of government, and find a want of correspondence here because Egypt and Syria were equally absolute monarchies with the others that had preceded them; that he should assert the impossibility of applying to them the phrase "it shall devour the whole earth," etc. because "so far from enlarging their dominions, they could not preserve what was left them by their ancestors." True, they tore to pieces their own kingdoms, but not until they had torn to pieces others. True, some of the race of the Syrian and Egyptian kings could not preserve what was left them by their ancestors. But it is enough to fulfil the prediction, if their *ancestors* were established in the empire of the East, even though some who came after them could not keep it. The dominion of the king of Syria is called "a great dominion" by the prophet, 11: 5, and precisely the same language and no more is used in describing Alexander's, viz. "he shall rule with great dominion," 11: 3. The qualifying remark is indeed added in 11: 4, that "not according to his dominion," shall they rule. No one of them should have his entire kingdom, no one and not all of them together rule with such glory, none make so rapid and so wide conquests. But still history affirms that Seleucus, the head of the Syrian dynasty, had all the Persian empire in the east from the Euphrates to the Indus, and much between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. Even Antiochus Epiphanes was at one time master of Assyria, Persia, Armenia, Syria, Palestine, and all Egypt but Alexandria. To him were they tributary. The prophet speaking of him also, says that he "waxed exceeding great," that "his power shall be mighty," and "he shall become strong with a small people." No more than this does he say of Alexander, the monarch of the world, See 8: 8, 9, 24. 11: 3, 23. If the objection were worth anything at all, it would apply as well to Rome, which could not pass the boundary of the Euphrates,

and many of whose kings could not preserve what was left them by their ancestors, nor many of the popes what was left the church by their predecessors.

The description is further continued, that in the little horn "were eyes like the eyes of man, a look more stout than his fellows, and a mouth speaking great things." The prophet heard "the voice of the great words which the horn spake." It "made war with the saints, and prevailed against them." And the angel said of him, "he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws," vs. 8, 11, 20, 21, 25.

This little horn, as has been shown, being the emblem of the dynasty of the Seleucidae—the race of the kings of Syria—and Antiochus Epiphanes being of that race, the general description is parallel to 8: 23—25, and 11: 22, 23, 31, 33, 36, 37. The phrase "eyes of man" denotes human sagacity and wisdom, for which Antiochus Epiphanes was noted, (see 11: 21, 24, 25.) The "stouter look" means the prouder mien, the more boastful bearing, of the king—in colloquial phrase it is *to look big*. All this appeared particularly in Antiochus Epiphanes, and in the greater pomp of the race of the Syrian kings who became strong above their cotemporaries—above the kings of Egypt, and the other successors of Alexander, with whom they shared the kingdom, Comp. 11: 5. His blasphemy and resolving to change times [set times or observances] and laws, have been illustrated under 11: 30, 31, 36—39,* and none can fail to see that here too, the correspondence is perfect, the application easy and unforced.

It is added that "the saints of the Most High shall be given into his hand until a time, and times, and the dividing of time," v. 25. What is the period here mentioned? There are two passages in Daniel where the word "times" means

* Interpretation, pp. 39—42, 55—57.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

years—the first in chap. 4: 16, 23, 25, 32, where predicting Nebuchadnezzar's insanity, the prophet says, "they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and seven times shall pass over thee." Here the phrase seven times, means in each of these verses indisputably seven *years;* they can mean nothing else. It is found again in 11: 13, where the phrase translated "after certain years," is literally *at the end of the times years*, i. e. times, viz. years, (the phraseology being like that in 8: 13, "the vision the daily sacrifice," or it may be simply, *at the end of years time.* The word is found also in 12: 7, where the phraseology is the same with this in chap. vii. It occurs again in the Revelation of St. John, 12: 14, with the same phraseology of time, times and a half. It is found in many places in the Bible in the sense of opportunity, season, set season. But there is no authority, whether expressed or implied, in the whole Bible, which sanctions the use of the word "times" in any other sense than *years*, when it is put for a definite portion of duration. There is no other clew to the meaning of the word when thus used, except that which is found in the above two passages in Dan. iv. and xi, and perhaps in the first alone. There is even no tradition of any other use except that which has sprung up since the Christian era, and the application of this prophecy to Rome. The writers who thus apply the prophecy make the time, times, and a half, something which they call *prophetic years;* first turning the years into days with 360 to a year, and then making the days *prophetic* days, i. e. 1260 *years.* This double transformation is only twofold less probable than that which has already been dwelt on respecting the 2300 days in 8: 14; and it has the less recommendation that the angel seems to give the prophet a *puzzle*, rather than an intelligible designation of time like all the other designations of time in the prophecies, and such as accords with the intelligible description of events in connexion with those designations of time. We must therefore understand the designation of "time, times,

and a dividing of time," as three literal years, and a half portion of a year—not an *exact* half necessarily; for according to scriptural usage it may be a little more or a little less, Comp. Exod. 24: 6. 1 Kings 16: 21. Num. 13: 24, Zech. 14: 2.

It has appeared under 11: 30—35, that from the setting up of the abomination of desolation in the temple during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, to the dedication of Judas Maccabeus and his followers, there were precisely three years. So it is asserted in the histories of the Maccabees, and so Josephus asserts it in his Antiquities, B. X. c. 11, sec. 7, and B. XII. c. 7, sec. 6. But previous to this final act of desecration; between it and the apostasy under Menelaus, there was another desecration by Apollonius, the same year with the final one. At that desecration by Apollonius, the daily sacrifice was taken away, and many other acts of oppression and cruelty were done, 1 Macc. 1: 38—40. It took place on the return of Antiochus from his last and unsuccessful expedition into Egypt. He started on that expedition 168 B. C., in the beginning of the spring,* and as he marched with all speed toward Alexandria, and after meeting the Roman ambassadors some miles above the city left the country again with despatch, he doubtless reached Palestine by the last of the ensuing May, if not earlier. He himself kept directly on to Antioch, while he detached Apollonius to ravage and lay waste the city and temple. Apollonius reaching Jerusalem about the first of June, between six and seven months earlier than the final act of desecration, it would make the period three years and about a half. Now though there is given in the histories of the Maccabees only the period of three years, and though Josephus in his Antiquities names the same period, there is adequate reason for the date of the three years and a

* The Roman historian Livy, mentions this time, as quoted by Prideaux, Vol. II. p. 120.

half as mentioned by Daniel. The others date from the setting up of *the abomination of desolation*, which was the deed on which they looked with most horror. Daniel dates in this place from the *saints being given into the hand of the Syrian king*,—an event which may well be assigned pre-eminently to the times of Apollonius. The writers of the books of the Maccabees speak of those times in a manner which shows they regarded the desecration by Apollonius as an era in the history of their nation, 1 Macc. 1: 39. 2 Macc. 5: 25—27. comp. with 6: 1.* And to confirm the point in question fully, there is also given by Josephus himself the period of *three years and a half*, in his History of the Wars of the Jews, B. i. c. 1. sec. 1, and B. v. c. 9. sec. 4. And even in his Antiquities, as we have seen at the close of the interpretation of chap. viii, he gives the period of 1296 days (a slightly erroneous quotation of the 1290 in 12: 11,) along with the three years—the first doubtless as the period reckoning from the taking away of the daily sacrifice—which was not three years and seven months, reckoning by the lunar method with the addition of the intercalary month, or by the method of 365 days to the year; just three years and seven months, reckoning by 360 days to the year. It deserves also to be borne in mind, that this date is the first given in the order of the prophecies. These three years and a half were the period of the greatest sufferings of the Jews, and their darkest hours. In the vision following this, chap. viii, we have seen that another and longer period is given which includes the beginning of the series of desecrations. The prophet does not give the period of the three years mentioned by Josephus, etc., because the desecration was virtually effected *when the daily sacrifice*

* It was mentioned under 8: 14, in respect to the reckoning of 1150 days, that Apollonius probably did not wait long before he accomplished the work on which he was sent. In 2 Macc. 5: 25 above quoted it reads, "who coming to Jerusalem and pretending peace, *did forbear till the holy day of the Sabbath*," etc.

was taken away, and the setting up of the abomination of desolation was in reality but a circumstance beside—it was but the seal and token of the impious work already done. The correspondence, then, between the period of time mentioned chap. vii, and the duration of the signal desecration and calamities under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, points to him, and in him to the race of the kings of Syria, as the king and dynasty meant by the angel in his explanation of the vision, viz.—" another shall rise after them . . . . . and he shall wear out the saints of the Most High, ... and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Not less conclusive does it seem to be, that the forced and unauthorized interpretation of the times for years, and of the *days* in those years for so many *years*, is an insuperable objection to the application so many make of this vision to civil and ecclesiastical Rome.

The doom of the Fourth Beast, and the end of the dominion of the Little Horn.

This is given in vs. 9—11, and in 26 comp. with 21, 22. The translation " till the thrones were cast down," conveys at first the idea of the overthrow of the empires represented by the four beasts. But both the context requires, and the original gives the sense, *till seats were placed*, i. e. for the judge, " the ancient of days," on one of which he sat. It is interpreted in v. 26, " the judgment shall sit"—it is also exchanged, v. 10, for the phrase " the judgment was set," i. e. the tribunal sat, the judge and those associated with him in giving judgment took their seats. The phrase " Ancient of days," though it undoubtedly designates the Eternal, presents the form of an aged person. His robe white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool, denote, like " spotless ermine," the perfect impartiality and integrity of the judge; his throne which was a fiery flame, and the wheels on which it

moved, which were burning fire, his swift and searching and fearful judgments (comp. Ezek. 1: 15, etc.); the stream of fire which issued from before him denotes his consuming power exercised against the guilty (comp. Deut. 4: 24, and Heb. 12: 29, "Our God is a consuming fire"); the multitude of his ministering attendants, the splendor of his court and the majesty of his reign; the opening of the books, his examination of deeds done, and of the law and sentence to be recited. The whole scene has for its ground-work the appearance of the Sanhedrim of the Jews, where the president of the council sat, with a vice-president on his right and left, and the other senators ranged in order at each side. To this council belonged the power of judging in capital cases, and the general affairs of the nation were brought before it. The prophet continued beholding, until the sentence was executed on the beast, that he should be slain, and his body given to the burning flame and destroyed—Comp. the words of our Savior, Matt. 5: 22, "whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hellfire;" where the imagery which he employs to denote the punishment of sin is taken from the valley of Hinnom, which was the place of public executions, and in which fire was constantly kept burning to consume the dead carcasses that were there thrown. This doom of the beast, expressed, like the character of the beast, in so figurative language, is explained by the angel in v. 26—"The tribunal shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, [his dominion shall be taken away,—See for the phraseology verse 5,] to consume and to destroy it unto the end." The actual burning of the king and of his dominions by fire is of course no more taught than his being literally a beast with teeth of iron and claws of brass, nor is the spectacle of the judgment here spoken of to take place literally, any more than the literal appearance of a horn with eyes, and its articulation of words. The prophet gives a *vision*, he does not state facts and oc-

currences which shall take place in the outward form in which he sees them.

Now is the language of this vision in vs. 9—11, of too high a character to be applied to the destruction of the kingdom of Alexander's successors, including the dominions of the kings of Syria? Certainly the language of verse 26, which the angel gives as the *explanation* of the vision, may consistently and adequately express no more than that destruction. There is no idea of literal burning conveyed by the word "consume." There is no such peculiarity in the phrase, "the judgment shall sit," as to make it a literal and formal scene; for similar phraseology is found in Joel 3: 12, where no such idea is conveyed—"Let the heathen be awakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about." Taking the explanation, therefore, given by the angel of the doom of the beast, there is, as we shall see, a perfect correspondence between the prophecy and the facts of history. But that we may go to those facts, without having the mind enveloped in any obscurity as to the nature of the figurative language employed in vs. 9—11, let us look first at a few parallel passages, in the light of which we shall clearly see that such language may be employed to denote the fall of an earthly kingdom.

Saith the Psalmist, (or Asaph for him,) on the occasion of his coming to the kingdom after Saul's death, Ps. lxxv, "When I shall receive the congregation, I will judge uprightly. The earth [the land] and all the inhabitants thereof are dissolved [the government under Saul's administration had fallen almost into dissolution]: I bear up the pillars of it [I will set up the pillars of the kingdom on their base, and make things firm again]. I said unto the fools.... Lift not up your horn on high.... For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up ano-

ther. [The Psalmist expresses this truth with particular application to Saul's overthrow, and his own elevation to the kingdom.] For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red: it is full of mixture, and he poureth out the same; but the dregs thereof all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out and drink them. [God thus pours out his judgments when he sits in judgment; and the Psalmist means to assert the fact with particular application to the death of Saul—See 1 Chron. 10: 13, 14—and to the ruin of the parties opposed to his own reign and attached to the house of Saul, See 2 Sam. 2: 8—3: 1.] All the horns of the wicked also will I cut off; but the horns of the righteous shall be exalted. [David says he would remove the unworthy from places of trust and authority, and exalt the righteous in their stead.]

Saith Moses in blessing the children of Israel before his death, "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints [holy ones]: from his right hand went a fiery law for them," Deut. 33: 2, comp. with Acts 7: 53. Gal. 3: 19. Col. 2: 18. Saith the prophet Habakkuk, chap. iii, in alarm at the approach of the Assyrian king, "O Lord, I have heard thy speech, [the threatening that the Jews should be invaded by the Chaldeans, 1: 6,] and was afraid. O Lord revive thy work in the midst of the years [do now as when thou broughtest thy people out of Egypt, and destroyed their enemies]. God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had horns coming out of his hand [rays were streaming forth from his hand]; and there was the hiding of his power. Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet [a description which had its correspondence in the *plagues* he sent upon the people]. He stood and measured the earth [the land]; he beheld and drove

asunder the nations [the nations occupying the land]; and the everlasting mountains were scattered and the perpetual hills did bow. . . . . Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thine anointed," [comp. Ps. 105: 14, 15, He suffered no man to do them wrong: yea, he reproved kings for their sakes, saying, Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm]. There is the language also of Daniel 2: 21. 4: 25, "He removeth kings and setteth up kings. The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will. And again, 5: 26—28, in the address of the prophet to Belshazzar in interpretation of "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin," [Upharsin is only another form of the word Peres, (Pheres,) v. 28, with the Hebrew conjunction untranslated,] "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it. Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." We would add to these especially Ps. xviii, but that some regard it as *typical*, and its bearing on the point in question they might not allow. Concerning the passages already quoted, none can fail to see their primary and sole application to temporal events—to the concerns of earthly kingdoms—to the dominions of the princes of this world. The descriptions are none the less striking and majestic than those in the vision of Daniel; they therefore give sanction to the use of the imagery in vs. 9—11, as a scenic representation of the event, that the judge of all the earth and God of nations would bring to an end and destroy the kingdom which should so long and grievously oppress the earth, and persecute the saints of the Most High.

Now we have seen that the dominion of Antiochus was taken away; he was broken without hand, he came to his end and there was none to help him. But more than this—the Syrian race of kings, of which he was one, and the Syrian kingdom over which he and others of the descendants of Seleucus ruled, perished. Syria was subdued by Pompey in the year

65 B. C., and made a Roman province. Antiochus Asiaticus was at that time the reigning monarch. He petitioned the Roman general to be restored to the throne of his forefathers, but was refused, and in him ended the kingdom of the Seleucidae, after it had existed 247 years from the return of Seleucus to Babylon, or the epoch of the Greeks; nor did it ever once recover from the blow. But this was not the whole fulfilment of the prophecy. The entire government of all Alexander's successors—the whole beast—was destroyed. We have seen that Lysimachus, one of the four between whom the empire was finally divided, was subdued, and his kingdom swallowed up by Seleucus. The sons of Cassander also, who was another of the four, were all cut off as early as 294 B. C., and Demetrius son of Antigonus got the kingdom in their stead; but he too, as we have seen was cut off by Seleucus in attempting to regain his father's lost dominions in Asia. His sons who survived him on the throne of Macedon, reigned until 168 B. C., when Perseus the last of the dynasty was conquered by the Romans, led through Rome to adorn the triumph of his conqueror, and died in prison. Macedonia was at that time only put under tribute, it was not made a Roman province; but on a rise of the people about 150 B. C. under two impostors in succession, to free themselves from the Romans, they were reduced to a province 148 B. C., and from that blow never recovered nor attempted to recover. The Macedonian kingdom was thenceforth destroyed, and it now forms a part of Turkey in Europe. None but Egypt remained of the wide dominion of the beast, and none but the descendants of Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, survived of the ten horns. That also was destroyed in the year 30 B. C. by Octavius Caesar, after it had existed almost 300 years under one race of sovereigns of whom Cleopatra, the daughter of the Ptolemies, was the last, and who, to avoid the disgrace of honoring the triumph of the Roman, put an end to her life by the poisonous bite of an asp.

The prophet says that "as concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season, v. 12. The Babylonians, after they were made subject to Persia, had sufficient strength to revolt, 517 B. C., thirteen years after the death of Cyrus, and set up a king of their own, and endure a siege against Darius the son of Hystaspes a year and eight months, and then their was taken only by stratagem. Its one hundred gates were taken away, its walls beat down from two hundred and fifty cubits high to fifty, that the people might no more revolt. From that time it decayed rapidly until it ended in "perpetual desolations," Jer. 25: 9. Persia too, in seventy years after Seleucus received it out of Alexander's empire, successfully revolted from the Syrian power, and it afterwards formed a part of the Parthian empire under Arsaces, which continued down to A. D. 229. At this period another Persian dynasty arose, founded by Ardshir-Babekan, or Artaxerxes, under which Persia again extended its conquests as far as Asia Minor and Egypt. This race of kings continued until A. D. 636, when Persia fell into the hands of the Arabs under Caliph Omar, and afterwards of the Turks, and continues there to this day.* The kingdom of Alexander also as such had some life, after its dominion was taken away; for one of his sons was permitted to hold the title of king fourteen years after his father's death, and Macedon was in form the seat of power, until Cassander put the young king to death. Not so the government of Alexander's successors. From the moment they were subjected to others, and made provinces, they had no name to live, they had no vitality left; no reprieve was given them, sentence of excision was cast on them and executed more immediately, and it has been more terrible, especially in respect to the kingdoms of the Lagidae and the Seleucidae—Egypt and Syria. "No country was more celebrated in antiquity than Syria. But ignorance,

* Encyc. Americ. Art. Persia.

superstition, and barbarism now cover the land, and no traces of its civilization remain but ruins." "Egypt was once the theatre of enterprise, civilization and science, and prospered most under the Ptolemies. It remained in the hands of the Romans 670 years. After the division of the empire in the time of Theodosius, Egypt became a province of the Eastern empire, and sunk deeper and deeper in barbarism and weakness," until with Syria it became a prey to the followers of Mohammed.* These two kingdoms of the Lagidae and the Seleucidae, the most glorious of those which succeeded Alexander's, and virtually uniting the whole of Alexander's empire in Asia, have since been the theatre of the most destructive wars and revolutions, and their fate has been preëminently more dreadful, their doom from the first more irrevocable, than that of any of the kingdoms which preceded them. It is as though they had been cleft down with the sword, and their carcasses given to the burning flame, Comp. Is. 29: 6—the language of the prophet to Jerusalem before the Captivity—"Thou shalt be visited with the flame of devouring fire;" and again, 9: 19, "The people shall be as the fuel of the fire." And even when the Romans had seized those kingdoms out of the hands of Alexander's successors, the nations of the East which had been successively swayed by Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus and Alexander, recovering themselves from their oppressors, remained for a yet longer season still—the Romans being unable to extend their destructive power beyond the Euphrates—*and therefore could be said to have had their lives prolonged for a season, after the kingdom which had once made them its prey was utterly destroyed.*

The reign of the Son of Man with the Saints.

This concludes the vision. It is contained in vs. 13, 14, and is explained by the angel in vs. 18, 22, 27. It is to be

* Encyc. Amer. Arts. Syria, Egypt.

observed, first, that the saints who are to possess the kingdom, are the same people, the same class, with those against whom the little horn made successful war, and whom the king that arose after the ten so much harassed. They were the true Israelites—the persecuted for righteousness' sake, and for attachment to the worship of God. The context absolutely demands this application, and the scope of the prophecy is not only that they should be delivered out of the hand of their oppressors, but reign when the kingdom of their oppressors was destroyed, and have for their king one described in the vision as "like the Son of man." Of course the *Romans* cannot be here meant, as some have supposed; for they were not "the people the saints," persecuted by the Syrian race of kings. Such an application must be at once seen to be inappropriate. Nor can the *Jews* as such be meant, for they did not come into the possession of the kingdom. But there was one who appeared in Judea, not long after Egypt, the last of the kingdom of Alexander's successors had fallen, and he so spake of himself as to intimate that he was the very "Son of man" whom the prophet saw in vision. He came in the form of a servant, was crucified, dead, and buried; but he rose from the dead, he ascended to heaven in the sight of many witnesses, and "a cloud received him out of their sight," Acts, 1: 9. There were true Israelites who received him as their king. In a single day three thousand were added to his kingdom, Acts 2: 41. They went forth into all nations, preaching the glad news of the kingdom, persuading both Jews and Gentiles, until the kingdom of their Lord had become co-extensive with the whole Roman world, and had penetrated beyond it. It was "the kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." The kingdom so long and so often promised, at last came into the hands of the true people of God. Judgment was rendered in their favor. They received not indeed a temporal kingdom, not a temporal deliverance, but a spiritual far more glorious than any temporal—a

deliverance shadowed forth by a temporal. And "the fulness of time" for it was at the expiration of the government that had so long oppressed them. It has proved not mutable and short-lived like the others that preceded them, but firm and enduring. Nor amid all the convulsions and revolutions of the nations, amid all the efforts of principalities and powers to destroy it in its infancy, and pluck the wings by which it has advanced to dominion, has its dominion been taken away, but it has already continued longer than any other kingdom in the world. The Church of Jesus Christ, which is the kingdom of the Son of man, was built by its founder on a rock against which no adverse powers have prevailed, nor can prevail. His dominion is already wide-spread, its limits were never more extended than at this day. It is not confined to a narrow province like Judea, or to the widest limits of any earthly kingdom, but reaching forth its broad arms literally encompasses the globe; and still wider conquests are to be made, for "he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet."

The order of objects as seen in this vision, confirms the interpretation given above to the fourth beast, as that interpretation gives force to this prophecy respecting the kingdom of the Messiah. The Son of man is represented as coming to the Ancient of days to receive the kingdom *after* the fourth beast was destroyed. The kingdom was given to the saints *after* the four kingdoms had all passed away. When therefore did that vision concerning the Son of man begin to have its accomplishment? When did Jesus Christ receive his kingdom? Need the numerous passages be quoted from the New Testament, which show that he was crowned king when he ascended to God's right hand? that he then received his royal investiture? that his kingdom was established almost nineteen centuries ago? Did not Jesus himself say on the mount of ascension, "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth? Matt. 28: 18. Did not the apostles

everywhere proclaim Jesus as reigning at the very time when they lived? Now by the application of this vision of the fourth beast to Rome, and by looking forward for the kingdom of the Son of man *to be* established, these nineteen centuries of the past reign of Christ are made a blank, the declarations of the New Testament inept and void, and Daniel is made not to prophecy here at all of the coming of the Messiah when he appeared first in Jerusalem. And Christian unites with Jew in asserting that the Son of man has not yet come. This is the great error of the theory that the world is to be destroyed in 1843. It entirely takes away this prophecy of Daniel from its application to the Christ who has already come, who has already received the kingdom from the Father. It confounds the *progress* of the kingdom *after* it is established, with the establishment itself. It disregards the explanation by our Savior that "the kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures *of* meal till the whole was leavened," Matt. 13: 33. Surely if there had been a prophecy respecting our own nation, previous to its independence, that the kingdom should be given to it, and its people rule from the Atlantic to the Pacific, he who in interpreting the prediction should now say that the kingdom had not yet been given to it, and that the prophecy was yet unfulfilled, would be thought to equivocate, or not to understand it. True the States of this Union do not yet stretch out as far as the Pacific, but the kingdom has been given to us. The prophecy would not now be all fulfilled, but still the dominion has been given to the people of these United States. So has the kingdom been given to the saints —they reign with their Lord, though not yet so widely and gloriously as they shall reign. In the *establishment* of *this* kingdom, we see that the other four have already been destroyed; for the dominion was given to the Son of man and to the saints *after* the destruction of the fourth beast. We see too that men in departing from the analogy of the rise

and progress of all other governments, and asserting that all this prophecy remains to be yet fulfilled, have failed to comprehend its real meaning.

The vision as above interpreted affords the strongest possible testimony that the Messiah has come, by fixing the period of his coming at the close of the dynasty of those kings who had so long oppressed the people of God. May Jew and Gentile, as they peruse the prophecy, and behold the evidences of its fulfilment around them, and the signs of a fulfilment still wider and more glorious, bow the knee to Jesus as the Christ, and receive with the saints that kingdom which shall never be moved.

SECTION IV.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAP. II. 31—45.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM.

A deeply interesting spectacle is presented in this chapter. The youthful Daniel stands before the greatest monarch of the world, pointing upward to the God of heaven, revealing another man's untold dream, and unfolding the events of future time. In the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, (the second of his *sole* reign, which was the Chaldean mode of computation, but the fourth or fifth from his being associated with his father, which was the epoch from which the Jews reckoned, (See 1: 1, 5 etc. compared with remarks on 7: 4,) this monarch "dreamed dreams;" probably had several unusual dreams in the course of the night, of which that mentioned in this chapter was the most extraordinary, and effectually broke off his slumbers, and left its disturbing influences behind. He calls together his wise men—the Magi and

the Chaldean astrologers and soothsayers—to enable him to understand the dream, and he commands that they shall reveal the dream itself, as well as tell the interpretation. It is the natural impression from the words "the thing is gone from me," vs. 5, 8, that Nebuchadnezzar *forgot* the dream; but many suppose that this phrase should read, "the *decree* has gone forth from me that if ye will not make known the dream, etc. ye shall be cut in pieces." But the natural impression is confirmed by the original; for the word "decree" as used in vs. 9, 13, 15 of this same chapter is a different word from that translated "thing," and the same word found in the phrase "the *thing* is gone from me," occurs again vs. 10, 23, where it is properly translated "the king's *matter*." Josephus also speaks of the king as having forgotten the dream, Antiq. B. x. ch. 10. sec. 3. It might seem strange that so remarkable a dream should be forgotten, but other dreams in the night, and the events of the morning and day, might drive much of it from the mind, and only an indistinct image remain. For a dream that is vivid in the morning, we often find it impossible to recal soon after, and voluntary and distinct trains of thought, unless committed immediately to paper, often pass soon out of one's mind. The king's wise men answered, as well they might, that they were unable to do what the king required; and on their remonstrating against the unreasonableness of his demands, he was roused to absolute fury, and suspecting doubtless their deceptive character, and impatient of contradiction or any thwarting of his will, he issued the decree that all the wise men in Babylon should be slain, and the executioners were going forth. Daniel and his companions were already numbered among the wise men, and had been in office a year or more, 1: 19, 20. The decree was sudden, like most things done by despots, and Daniel knew nothing of it, until he was sought to be slain. On learning the cause, he requested of the king a delay of the sentence, and gave assurance that he would re-

veal the secret. When he had obtained his request, he went to his companions, made known to them the state of things, and besought their supplications concerning the matter to the God of heaven. The night following, the monarch's dream was revealed to him in vision.

The phenomena of dreaming have baffled the acutest inquiries. There may be some general laws pertaining to them —that dreams are influenced by the principle of association; (as where a person ill and with draughts applied to the feet has dreamed of standing on the crater of Aetna;) that they also depend somewhat on the temper of mind, on character and habits. But there is no way of accounting for the case before us except by supposing that God must have produced the images both on Nebuchadnezzar's mind, and on Daniel's. And yet even this dream, while God was its author, followed in some degree the law of the monarch's disposition. For as Grotius has well remarked, (quoted by Bishop Newton p. 201,) "this image appeared with glorious lustre in the imagination of Nebuchadnezzar, whose mind was wholly taken up with admiration of worldly pomp and splendor; whereas the same monarchies were afterward represented to Daniel under the shape of fierce and wild beasts, as being the great supporters of idolatry and tyranny in the world."

Daniel hastens to the captain of the king's body-guard, and by him was brought into the king's presence.* With true

* Verse 25 reads thus: "Then Arioch brought in Daniel before the king in haste, and said thus unto him, I have found a man of the captives of Judah, that will make known unto the king the interpretation." Rosenmüller remarks on this, "that the writer seems to have forgotten that he had said in v. 16 that Daniel had entered the presence of the king, to obtain a reprieve of the sentence, and an interval of time at the expiration of which he would tell the interpretation of the dream." Now the text is very easy to be reconciled. Daniel may not have seen the king *personally* the first time, but obtained his request through Arioch—just as the centurion in Matt. 8: 5 is said to have come to Jesus, when we know from Luke 7: 3 that he

modesty and greatness, having disclaimed any ability or merit beyond others, and ascribed all to the God of heaven who reveals it for others' sakes as well as his own, he proceeds to tell the dream.

31 Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness *was* excellent, stood before thee; and
32 the form thereof *was* terrible. This image's head *was* of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass,
33 his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou
34 sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet *that were* of iron and clay, and brake them to
35 pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image
36 became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. This *is* the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king.

The dream will need no remarks except what will be made on Daniel's interpretation of it.

37 Thou, O king, *art* a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath
38 given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou *art* this head of gold.

Nebuchadnezzar the representative and founder of the Chaldean monarchy, being thus made the head, the prophet leaves us in no doubt where to begin the series of kingdoms in this, and in the other prophecies. For the illustration of these verses, see remarks on 7: 4. Compare also Jer. 27: 5—7, "I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet

sent some Jewish elders. Josephus also explains it in like manner, Antiq. x. c. 10. sec. 3.

unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come: and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him:" Of course the Scriptures do not teach that literally *all* nations, and the *whole* habitable world were given into his hand, but it is figurative language employed to describe a very great dominion.

The "head of gold" is an appropriate emblem of the magnificence and wealth of the Chaldean empire under Nebuchadnezzar. He built the prodigious brick walls of Babylon, which according to Herodotus formed a square, and were 87 ft. in thickness, 350 feet high, and 60 miles in compass. In each of the four sides were 25 gates, 100 in all, which were of solid brass. Between every two of these gates were generally but not always three towers, and one at each of the four corners of the walls, and three between each corner and the next gate on either side, 250 in all, and every one 10 ft. higher than the walls. Outside surrounding the wall was a vast ditch, from which the clay was taken to make the bricks, and which also made the city inaccessible to an enemy. From the twenty-five gates on each side of the square went 25 streets in a direct line over to the opposite gates, thus making 50 streets, each 15 miles long and 150 ft. wide; and besides these were four streets running along adjacent to the walls, 200 ft. broad. By these streets the city was divided into 676 squares, each 2¼ miles in compass, and round these squares on every side stood the houses, facing the street, three or four stories high, and greatly adorned. The space within each of the squares was formed into yards, gardens and pleasure grounds. A branch of the river Euphrates ran through the city, and over it was a bridge a furlong in length, and thirty feet in breadth, built with great art and expense. On

each side of the river, within the city, Nebuchadnezzar built from the bed of the river a great wall for its banks, of the same thickness with the walls of the city, and over against every street that crossed the river a brazen gate in the wall, shut by night, and open by day, with stairs leading down to the river; and this river-wall was 20 miles in extent, reaching two and a half miles beyond the city on each side where the river passed. While this wall on either bank was building, the river was turned another way into a prodigious artificial lake from 35 to 75 ft. deep, 40 miles square, and 160 miles in compass. Into this lake the surplus of the water flowed in time of freshet, and here too Cyrus caused the river to flow when he took the city, and marched up the bed of the river, and found the gates not shut but left open in the dissipation of that night, Compare on 7: 4.

Another great work was the temple of Belus, all of which, however, was not built by Nebuchadnezzar, but the original tower was undoubtedly the tower of Babel. It was more wonderful than any of the pyramids, smaller indeed by 100 ft. at the base, but higher by more than 100 feet. The ascent was by steps winding up the outside, which formed part of the structure like the steps of the pyramid; and made the whole look like eight towers one built on another, and each 75 ft. high. The upper story was the most sacred place, and over this was the observatory for the astronomers. Nebuchadnezzar enlarged this tower by vast buildings around it in the form of a square a mile in circumference, and on the outside of the square was a wall enclosing the whole. Here Nebuchadnezzar put the spoils of the sanctuary of Jerusalem, which he plundered, and he made it his great treasury, Dan. 1: 2. It stood until the return of Xerxes from his expedition into Greece, who demolished it, having first taken from it to counterbalance the expenses of his invasion, immense treasures among which were many statues of massive gold, and one 40 ft. high, whose single value was at least 12 millions of

dollars, and which with a pedestal of 50 ft. was probably the golden image set up for worship in the plain of Dura near the city, 3: 1, etc.*

Equally wonderful were the hanging-gardens at Nebuchadnezzar's new palace. They contained a square of 400 ft. on each side, and were terraced up till the highest equalled the height of the wall of the city, the ascent being from terrace to terrace by stairs ten feet wide. The whole pile was sustained by vast arches built upon arches, and strengthened by a wall 22 ft. thick, surrounding it on every side. The floors on the top of these arches were laid in the following manner: —they were flat stones 16 ft. long, and four broad, and over them was a layer of reed, mixed with a great quantity of bitumen, and upon the reed two rows of bricks, and over the whole of this thick sheets of lead. Upon the lead was placed the mould, whose moisture it was the design of the previous preparation to preserve. The mould was of sufficient depth for the largest trees, and an engine was placed at the top to draw water from the river for the garden. Nebuchadnezzar did not live long enough to complete all his works, but Nitocris his daughter-in-law, and wife of Evil-merodach, (see on 8: 1,) carried out his designs in a manner that has united her fame in antient history with the splendor of the Chaldean empire.†

39 And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth.

The prophet in saying "after thee" uses king as synony-

* It is not strange that the antient historians should speak of Xerxes' immense wealth even after the expenses of such a campaign, see on 11: 2.

† Prideaux, Vol. 1. pp. 120—126. Bib. Repos. Vol. 7. pp. 364 etc. See also Is. x, and xiv, where Babylon is called "the golden city," and the glory of the empire is exhibited in striking contrast with its downfall.

mous with *kingdom*, see on 8: 3. He means, *after thy kingdom*. Next after the Chaldean monarchy was the Medo-Persian, signified in the image or colossus by the breast and arms of silver; and next after the Medo-Persian was the Grecian under Alexander, represented by the belly and thighs of brass.

The Persian empire at its height of glory was inferior to the empire of Nebuchadnezzar, as silver is inferior to gold; it made not such far conquest, it was neither so powerful nor so rich. The dominion of Greece under Alexander was after all but the acquisition of the degenerated empire of Persia; and though in the fame of its rapid and far exploits it has shone more brightly, the empire itself was as inferior to the Persian as that to the Babylonian. Alexander, had he lived, would probably have outdone his Eastern predecessors in great public works, and carried the glory of Greece higher than that of Chaldea or Persia, but he was cut off in the midst of his days, and (Alexandria excepted, which he began but which was perfected by the Ptolemies,) before he had done anything except to wrest their possessions from others, See further on chaps. vii. and viii. It would seem rather arbitrary to find a perfect likeness between every part of the image and the corresponding kingdoms denoted. Only a general outline and correspondence may be intended, and if so, it would be as unwise to seek for an exact likeness as to hunt any metaphor on all fours and pursue it until completely run down. Nevertheless a likeness may be traced out, if one chooses. The two arms may denote the union of the Medes and the Persians as the two arms are united in the chest.* The belly and thighs may signify Alexander or Macedon leaning on the two great divisions of Greece which had been opposed to each other, but became united in the invasion of Asia, viz. Thebes and Athens, the ruling cities of Greece.

* Josephus finds the two arms and hands in the two kings, (Darius and Cyrus,) who subdued Babylon, Antiq. B. x. c. 10. sec. 4.

40 And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch
as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all *things;* and as iron
41 that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And
whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and
part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in
it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron
42 mixed with miry clay. And *as* the toes of the feet *were* part of
iron, and part of clay, *so* the kingdom shall be partly strong, and
43 partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry
clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they
shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with
clay.

To what dominion does the prophet here refer? What monarchy is symbolized by the legs of iron and feet part of clay and part of iron?

With the explanations already given of chaps. xi, viii. and vii, and the considerations there presented, and with the universal admission that this prophecy in chap. ii. is but the germ of which all the others are the fuller development, (Bishop Newton calls it "the groundwork of all the rest," Proph. p. 103,) we must seek for this fourth kingdom of iron in that which immediately succeeded the Grecian under Alexander, and the imagery itself most naturally designates that. The statue symbolizes four monarchies, the three first of which we have seen to grow into each other as members of one body, viz. the Persian into the Chaldean, and the Grecian into the Persian. We have seen also that the kingdom of Alexander's generals grew into the Grecian as that did into the Persian, but that the Roman never grew into the kingdom of Alexander and his successors beyond the Euphrates; and therefore on any supposition that the kingdoms of Alexander and his successors are here set forth as one and the same, there is a failure in the emblematic connexion, because the Roman did not grow into the kingdom of Alexander and his successors considered as one, as that grew into the Persian.

The two legs of iron, and the two feet and ten toes of iron mixed with clay, fitly represent the two kingdoms of the Lagidae and Seleucidae—Egypt and Syria—into which the empire of the eastern world was constituted not many years after Alexander's death. They were cotemporaneous. They were the only ones that had much connexion with the Jewish nation; and, as Bishop Newton remarks, "it is the purpose of the Holy Scriptures to interweave so much of foreign affairs as hath some relation to the Jews." They were of iron strength under Seleucus I. and Ptolemy I, their founders, but grew weak and fragile afterward, and yet possessed iron strength in close connexion with periods of weakness, as shown in different parts of the reign of Antiochus the Great, 11: 11, 15, 19; in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes as contrasted with that of Seleucus Philopator, 11: 20, 23; in the reign of Ptolemy Philopater as contrasted with Ptolemy Epiphanes, 11: 11, 15; in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes I, as contrasted with Antiochus II, 11: 7, 8—and it needs not more words to show that those speak contrary to facts who say that these kingdoms so far from being stronger were much weaker than any of the former kingdoms. The destructive effects of their iron rule in subduing and dashing the nations to pieces, especially Palestine, have been already shown in the other chapters. The blended iron and clay are seen in the weak and broken condition both of the nations and kings from mutual wars and internal party commotions. They were united often by treaty and by intermarriage—Antiochus Theus married Berenice daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 11: 6; Antiochus the Great gave his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy Epiphanes, 11: 15; Magas, half brother to P. Philadelphus married Apame daughter of Antiochus Soter; but still they did not cleave to one another in faithful alliance, even as iron is not mixed with clay.*

* Dr. Adam Clarke, who does not find the kingdoms of Syria and Egypt in chap. vii, yet sees such a correspondence between them and

It has been urged by some, that as in v. 41 the feet and toes part of iron and part of clay denote that the "kingdom shall be divided," it implies that the kingdom was at first a whole, and only at a later period was divided—i. e. that the entirely iron legs must symbolize an undivided kingdom, and therefore could not designate the two dynasties of the Lagidae and Seleucidae.* But surely the part iron and part clay do not denote such a division as this objection contemplates—a division into kingdoms of which some are symbolized by the clay, and others by the iron. It is that the two respective dynasties shall be divided among themselves; and so were the Lagidae and Seleucidae. There was the division in the Syrian kingdom after the death of Seleucus Philopater, see on 11: 21. There was the division particularly in Egypt in respect to the two Ptolemies, with yet other dissensions and conspiracies, see on 11: 14, 26, 27; and that the word translated *to divide* may denote no more than such divisions as these, see Ps. 55: 9, where the same word is found in the phrase "Destroy, O Lord, and divide their tongues."

It is objected also by Bishop Newton, p. 190, that "this kingdom was divided into ten toes: but when or where were the kingdoms of the Lagidae and of the Seleucidae divided into so many parts?" It ought to be enough to reply that the prophet does not expressly make the ten toes emblematical of so many parts of a kingdom. He does not here use the number ten at all, and the toes are not mentioned in the

---

the description in these verses, that he remarks thus on them—"Legs of iron, and feet and toes of iron and clay—I think this means in the first place the kingdom of the Lagidae, in Egypt; and the kingdom of the Seleucidae, in Syria. And, secondly, the Roman empire which was properly composed of them." His judgment may be an off-set to those who find no such correspondence, but the Romans certainly cannot form one kingdom with the Syrians and Egyptians, and both together be the fourth.

* An objection of Hengstenberg as given in the Christian Review, p. 17.

dream itself. To attempt to find something to answer to the toes, is no better than to attempt to find in the Persian empire something to answer to the *fingers*. Manifestly, the feet and toes have the same relation to the legs, that the hands and fingers do to the arms; they belong to the same dominion, and the sole reason why the feet and toes are mentioned seem to be that they show the relative strength of one and the same dominion with the legs at different periods of time—the iron at the beginning, and the feet and toes at the end. The correspondence between the number ten toes and ten horns is but accidental. Moreover, the dream is that the image is smitten on the *feet*, it does not say on the toes. Now if, as those who apply this to Rome say, the toes are separate from the feet, and denote the ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire was subsequently divided, and the feet now exist not, but only the toes, then there is a confusion in the emblem; for the stone smites the *feet*, not the toes, but according to those who apply it to Rome, it ought to smite the *toes*. Nevertheless, if a correspondence is insisted on, what should the *toes* denote except not the kingdoms but the kings?

The antients supposed on this, as on the vision of the beasts, that the fourth kingdom was the Roman. And Josephus also seems to have the same opinion. For he thus speaks after having given the signification of the two arms of the statue—"But another king that shall come from the west, armed with brass, [by which he seems to think the brass has some allusion to the brazen armor known to have been worn by the Greeks,] shall destroy that government [viz. the Persian]; and another government, that shall be like unto iron, shall put an end to the power of the former, and shall have dominion over all the earth, on account of the nature of iron, which is stronger than that of gold, of silver and of brass. Daniel did also declare the meaning of the stone to the king; but I do not think proper to relate it, since I have only un-

dertaken to describe things past or things present, but not things that are future." Josephus here seems to entertain the opinion and hope of many of his countrymen that the fourth kingdom was the Roman, and that it would be destroyed by the Messiah;* but he does not express it for reasons of worldly policy, and for the same reason he seems to have been silent on the vision of the four beasts. That the reasons, however, which indueed him with others to entertain such an opinion, lay in the circumstances of his times, and therefore ought not to have any more than the weight of a mere *opinion*, has already been remarked on chap. vii. And it can have no more weight than that, especially when we consider that Josephus applied to the Roman emperor Vespasian the predictions of the Old Testament on which his countrymen had relied for their faith in the coming of the Messiah to receive dominion over the world, (Wars of the Jews, B. vi. c. 5. sec. 4.)

To some it also appears a difficulty that an empire so great as Rome, and so intimately connected with the history of the Jews and the instrument of the final overthrow of the city and temple, should not be included in this series of kingdoms. But it is a sufficient consideration that it did not enter into the object of these prophecies of Daniel to make the Roman kingdom one of the series. We are to rest satisfied with the facts in the case. Besides, the kingdom of Nineveh was not mentioned, which was before the Chaldean, nor is the kingdom of the Turks given who have already trodden the holy city and sanctuary under foot as long and as cruelly

* Having spoken of two kings, viz. Cyrus and Darius, he says another shall come and destroy that government. So another still shall come and destroy the government of Alexander—of course he means the government of Alexander's successors, as he also meant the government of Cyrus' successors; and it is certain that he often speaks of the Syrian government as that of the Macedonians, as in Book xii. c. 7. Sec. 6.

as the Romans ever did. Says Bishop Newton speaking of those four kingdoms—"Not but that there have been empires as great or greater than some of these, as those of the Tartars for instance, and of the Saracens, and of the Turks." Why ask for the admission of Rome into this image, more than the dominion of the Moslem.

The particular design of closing the series of the kingdoms with the kingdom of Alexander's successors is however not difficult to be perceived, and it will be brought out clearly in the interpretation of the remaining verses. For the prophet was appointed to give a clew to the time of the first advent of our Lord Jesus Christ upon earth, *who was to appear at the close of a series of kingdoms the last of which had been a great oppressor of the people of God.* The visions were thus a guide to Christ, so that none need mistake.

44 And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, *but* it shall break in pieces and consume
45 all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. [:] Forasmuch as [because] thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; [.] the [The] great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream *is* certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.

There can be no doubt that this kingdom is the same with that which, in chap. vii, is given to the Son of man and to the holy people of the Most High, and in the light of that chapter we see clearly it cannot be the empire of Rome, but the kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Does the phrase, then, "in the days of these kings," point out with sufficient definiteness the rise of this new kingdom? First, what does the phrase mean? Does it mean, in the midst of their reign? while those kings were on the throne? The preposition in the phrase is often used to denote *time finished* —so Gesenius the Hebrew lexicographer gives it, and so

usage demands. For instance, the same preposition with the same construction is found in Num. 28: 26, where it is properly translated in our English Bible as follows—"*after your weeks be out.*" Also in Ecclesiastes 11: 1, "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it *after many days.*" Also Dan. 11: 20, "*Within few days* [when a few days shall have expired] he shall be destroyed." In the last two of these instances, however, the meaning may be that the thing spoken of shall take place *within certain limits—within certain days;* but in the first the usage is clear and beyond question.

Now to apply this to the phrase in Daniel 2: 44—"In the days of these kings." *After their successive reigns were out,* after they had fully expired, there arose next in succession the kingdom of Jesus Christ, the Son of man. The kingdoms of Babylon, of Persia, of Macedon, had passed away; the kingdoms of the Seleucidae and the Lagidae—Syria and Egypt—had come to an end, the last of them only thirty-five years B. C. Next in order of succession, and with but little longer lapse of time than existed between the fall of Alexander, and the partition of his empire between Ptolemy, Seleucus, Cassander and Lysimachus, there was established the spiritual reign of the Son of God. The prophet looking down a remote tract of time, and beholding a succession of four kingdoms, and of still another and a greater and more glorious to arise next after the fourth, properly uses the phrase, "After the days of these kings." Even with the shade of meaning, *Within* the days of these kings, the prophet's language has its accomplishment in the facts above stated. Within the days of what kings? If we must be guided by the language employed in describing the statue and its overthrow, where the stone breaks in pieces not only the iron and clay but also the brass and the silver and the gold, then are we to conceive of the brass and silver and gold as still existing, in some sort, when the stone smites the image on the

feet—in other words the kings, or kingdoms, exist which correspond to the brass, silver and gold. Now when the fourth kingdom was destroyed, the lives of the others were prolonged, though their dominion was taken away. When Syria and Egypt were destroyed, the nations beyond the Euphrates were spared. Hence the fourth kingdom could be appropriately described as set up *within* the days of those kings, or kingdoms, i. e. before they were all utterly destroyed; and the era of the *rise* of the fifth kingdom would be determined by the destruction of the fourth.

This fifth kingdom set up by the God of heaven is designated by a stone cut out of the mountain without hands. The position of the colossal statue is to be conceived as in a valley near the foot of a precipice, from whose summit a piece suddenly breaks off by no human instrumentality, and falls and smites the statue on the feet, crushing them by its weight, causing the whole statue to fall, and then rolling over it and grinding it to the finest dust which the wind blows entirely away; and afterwards the stone which smites the image becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth.

Now as matter of fact we know that it was the Roman armies which destroyed the fourth kingdom; how is this to be reconciled with the prediction that the fifth kingdom should do it, and that fifth kingdom be the kingdom of Christ? There is all the explanation that we need in language used by our Savior in a parable recorded in Matt. 22: 2—7, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding; and they would not come. Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, ... all things are ready. . . . . But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandize. And the remnant took his servants, and entreated them spitefully, and slew them. But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies,

and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city." Now though this was applied to the Jews, the *principle* applies to the destruction of the fourth kingdom by the Roman armies—the same armies of the king which afterwards were commissioned to destroy Jerusalem. And though as matter of fact Christ's kingdom was not fully established until the Romans had already done the work of destroying the fourth kingdom, yet in proximity of time to that work, and in the preparation for the fifth kingdom then shortly to appear, the facts might truly be shadowed forth under such imagery as Daniel employs. For it was the God of heaven who commissioned those armies to do the work of destroying that persecuting kingdom, and the same God of heaven was even then about laying the foundations of the new spiritual kingdom which was never to be destroyed—never to be left to other people, never overthrown by other people as the Babylonian was by the Medes and Persians, and the Medo-Persian by the Greeks under Alexander, and the kingdom of Alexander by his usurping successors and the murderers of his offspring. Under such imagery derived from temporal kingdoms was shadowed forth the spiritual kingdom in which the saints should reign with the Son of man.

By the imagery of the stone cut out of the mountain without hands and smiting the statue, is also symbolically taught that the kingdom of heaven arising by no human might and power but by the Spirit of the Lord of Hosts, should enter the very seats of those four great nations, and destroy the dominion of Satan where it had so long existed. As matter of fact, Christianity made its beginning in the kingdom of the Seleucidae, "*the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch*," Acts 11: 26. IT SMOTE THE COLOSSAL KINGDOM OF EVIL ON THE FEET. And it extended into Egypt, and into the remotest nations of the East farther than the sceptre of Alexander ever reached. Said even one in the primitive age, "The gospel was preached to every creature which is

under heaven"—and again, "Verily their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world," Coloss. 1: 23. Rom. 10: 18. That new power so efficacious, was Christianity. That new kingdom was the Christian Church of which Jesus Christ was made the head when "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all," Eph. 1: 17—23. This kingdom did not come as the Jews, from too literal an interpretation of the prophecies, supposed it would come, in the form of the earthly throne of David given to the son of David. It did not come even as the disciples supposed after the resurrection of their Lord, when they asked the question, Acts 1: 6, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" The kingdom was not restored to Israel in the sense in which the Israelites hoped—when, being erected in the holy land, it should immediately destroy all other nations, and grow into a universal earthly monarchy of surpassing glory. Said our Savior himself "My kingdom is not of this world; if it were, then would my servants fight for it," John 18: 36. And said he again, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; behold, the kingdom of God is within you," Luke 17: 20. It came not with worldly pomp and splendor, but was to be set up in the hearts of men. By its power and efficacy it would in the end overthrow all idolatry, and all institutions hurtful and oppressive to the world.

"There is one aspect in which the prediction must be regarded as still more literal. Christ said of himself as the corner stone, "Whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to pow-

der," Matt. 21: 44. Evil would struggle hard to maintain its ascendancy in the world, wicked men and wicked nations would oppose the progress of his religion, but they should be miserably destroyed.

How far does the history of the world since Christ came verify the predictions respecting the power and progress of his kingdom? He who looks down through the ages to the Christian era, will see that the fulfilment has been most remarkable. In less than four hundred years the public rites of heathenism were all abolished throughout the wide Roman world.* Despotic institutions have in many countries been overthrown, and in their place others have been substituted sacredly regarding the life and liberty and happiness of the people. Cities and nations opposed to Christ's kingdom and persecuting the saints, have been broken to pieces and scattered; and among them are numbered Antioch and Alexandria, the seats of power in the ancient dynasties of Alexander's successors—Antioch, once greater and richer than Rome itself, and the Queen of the East, which now exhibits hardly any relics of her former splendor, and whose very ruins are constantly thrown down by earthquakes—Alexandria, the ancient seat of commerce and learning and the arts, the abode of luxury and taste, of which nothing remains except a portico in the vicinity of the gate leading to Rosetta, the southwestern amphitheatre, Cleopatra's obelisk or needle, and Pompey's pillar; its population once 300,000 now but 12,690.† There is Jerusalem too, and Chorazin, and Bethsaida, and Capernaum. There is the Roman empire which in its turn persecuted the saints of the Most High, and has been destroyed. The words of a prophet have been literally fulfilled—"I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is; and I will give it to him," Ezek. 21: 27. But the higher and more character-

* See Gibbon's testimony, Interpr. p. 44.

† Encyc. Americana, Arts. Antioch and Alexandria.

istic reign of the Son of Man has been the holiness to which it has given birth in the hearts of multitudes; in the redemption of men from the bondage of sin to the liberty of sons of God, and in their consequent meetness to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. Over all opposition Christianity has triumphed, her dominion down to this very day has been growing wider and wider, gathering strength in her onward course, and in her past triumphs giving pledge that

> "Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
> Does his successive journeys run;
> His kingdom stretch from shore to shore
> Till moons shall wax and wane no more."

In concluding this chapter it may be asked, can that interpretation be the true one which asserts that the kingdom of heaven has not yet been set up in the world? And yet this is the universal interpretation of those who teach the second advent of Christ in A. D. 1843; and not of theirs only, but it is the necessary deduction made by such men as Bishop Newton, who applying the fourth kingdom to political and ecclesiastical Rome look for the accomplishment of what is here said of the fifth kingdom not until ecclesiastical Rome or the Papacy is destroyed. The reasons they assign are, (1) "that the destruction of all the former kingdoms [the Roman included as the fourth] was to precede its establishment; (2) that the kingdom is to fill the whole earth, which it now does not." But it is clear that the fourth kingdom was the kingdom which succeeded Alexander's, and the facts in regard to Christianity also oblige us to fix on that kingdom as the fourth. Surely the prophecy itself, so far from asserting that the kingdom of heaven shall, when established, at once fill the whole earth, teaches the contrary, and what we have seen under chap. viii. to be corroborated by the teachings of Christ, viz. that its progress was to be *like a stone growing into a mountain*. It is growing still, it is lifting up its head higher and

more serenely to heaven, and stretching out its ample sides toward the ends of the earth. What! is not that kingdom of heaven established, not though the wise men from the east where Daniel delivered this very prophecy among them, came to Jerusalem at the birth of Jesus, and asked, Where is he that is born king of the Jews, and finding him at Bethlehem fell down and paid him homage? Not though the same angel Gabriel who revealed the visions to Daniel, came also to Mary and having promised that she should have a son whose name should be called Jesus, added, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end?"* Not though Zecharias filled with the Holy Ghost spake—"Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began?"† Not though our Lord himself said, "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force?"‡ Has not Christ yet established his kingdom, not though he himself said, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven?"§ Not though he was "declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead?"‖ Not though apostles in the primitive age gave thanks in the name of believers that the Father had delivered them from the power of darkness, and translated them into the kingdom of his dear Son?¶ A theory which asserts that this kingdom of heaven is not yet established, that it is not yet in the earth, does violence to the whole scope of prophecy and gospel. Wherever there is one heart filled with right-

* Luke 1: 32, 33. † Ib. vs. 68—70. ‡ Matt. 11: 12. § Luke 10: 18. ‖ Rom. 1: 4. ¶ Col. 1: 13.

eousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, there is the kingdom of God. So long as there shall be one on earth obedient to the laws of Christ, the kingdom is not left to others. But amidst whatever decline of Christianity in the earth, amidst whatever corruptions in the Church, the true kingdom of God has had its throne in many hearts, it has been within many pure souls, and a band could at any time have been found, larger than that small remnant who in the corruptest period of the antient church numbered seven thousand, or that smaller remnant under the heroic and faithful sons of Mattathias. How much more than that number now exist, and with all the abatements that may be made for the "many who cleave to the host with flatteries," what multitudes are enrolled as the true saints of the Most High! Surely this kingdom is in the world! It has not yet the strength it is destined to have, it has not yet made all its conquests, but in the very spirit of this prophecy "a crown has been given to one who has gone forth conquering and to conquer," Rev. 6: 2. ITS FINAL ISSUES ARE WITH GOD.

The rise of this kingdom after four great kingdoms and at a period concerning which there could be no mistake, its establishment, its perpetuity, its destined progress, its universal triumph, the prophet has here predicted. But the term of that progress, the time which should elapse before it should become a universal kingdom, its duration in this world, the prophet does not give, and the angel was not sent to explain. It was predicted that the kingdom should stand forever, even forever and ever, (Dan. 7: 18). The kingdom of God contemplated as a kingdom of righteousness, peace and joy, SHALL endure literally forever and ever. No changes in time or space can affect it, not the final dissolution of the present globe, not the coming of the end when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father, 1 Cor. 15: 24. For the saints shall still reign more gloriously under God as all in all, (1 Cor. 15: 28,) and the splendor of heaven

shall be only the farther and brighter shining of those rays of light that first scattered the darkness of this sinful world. The kingdom established by the God of heaven seems, however, to be rather the *mediatorial* kingdom of Christ, which had its commencement with the ascension of Christ, which has been progressing since, and which is to be one day consummated with the destruction of the last enemy death, and with the resurrection of the dead, and with the personal appearing of Christ in like manner as the disciples saw him go into heaven, (Acts 1: 11,) and with the retributions of eternity. That mediatorial kingdom is to last forever and ever, in the sense that it is not to be subject to entire revolutions and overtures and ruin like the kingdoms of the world. But when all the purposes for which God established it shall have their accomplishment, "then cometh the end," 1 Cor. 15: 24. The phraseology by which its perpetuity is denoted is the same with that in Ps. 148: 5, where the Psalmist having spoken of the heavens and the waters above the heavens which the Lord created, adds, "He hath also established them forever and ever," Comp. also Is. 30: 8, and Jer. 7: 7. Now an apostle says that "these same heavens, and the earth which are now," and which the Psalmist declares are established forever and ever, "by the same word are reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men," 2 Peter 3: 7. The personal appearing of Christ "who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom," (2 Tim. 4: 1,) when all things shall be subdued unto him, is not to be confounded with the establishment and progress of his kingdom, it is its consummation. For this consummation primitive Christians 1800 years ago waited and believed it would come. For it Christians in every age should wait, and "show the Lord's death until he come," (1 Cor. 11: 26,) for "unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin [without becoming again a sacrifice for sin] unto salvation," Heb. 9: 28. But the *presumption* of

him who fixes on the *time* of that appearing, is not less than the *indifference* of him who saith in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming.

SECTION V.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAP. IX: 24—27.

THE VISION OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

This is an exceedingly difficult passage of Scripture, and he who does not feel it to be so, has never studied it thoroughly. It needs, for understanding it, whatever discipline may have been gained by a study of the other visions. The results arrived at in the following interpretation, are, that this vision is properly A SUPPLEMENT TO THE VISION IN CHAPTER VIII.; that the period of the 70 weeks reach down to the death of our Lord Jesus Christ and the establishment of the gospel dispensation on his resurrection and ascension; that "the Messiah the Prince" is Jesus made both Lord and Christ, the same with the person seen in the vision in chap vii. as "one like the Son of man" to whom was given an everlasting dominion that all nations should serve him.

24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to
25 anoint the Most Holy. Know therefore and understand, *that* from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince *shall be* seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall,
26 even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof *shall be* with a flood, and unto the end of the
27 war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations, he shall make *it* desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

The occasion on which this prophecy was given is narrated in the preceding part of the chapter. In the first year of the same Darius mentioned 11: 1, (called in 9: 1, the son of Ahasuerus, i. e. Astyages I, and not the Ahasuerus of Ezra and Esther,) and when Babylon had fallen before the victorious army of the Medes and Persians, it was known to Daniel that the 70 years' captivity, as specified by Jeremiah the prophet, was drawing to an end. One great event predicted by Jeremiah, that at the close of the seventy years Babylon in its turn should be made desolate, and its kings no longer reign, was already accomplished, Jer. 25: 12—14 and Dan. 5: 31. The other great event that the Jews should then be restored to Jerusalem, now remained, Jer. 29: 10—14. In connexion with the promise of their return it was also added, "Ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart." With this spirit of earnest supplication, Daniel now sought the Lord for the fulfilment of the promise. He prayed in behalf of Israel, he identified himself with them, felt their lot his, their transgressions and iniquity his, their punishment his; he confessed not only the sins of his countrymen, but his own sins, righteous man though he was; and God was truly found of him, while he thus sought him and implored his mercies and forgivenesses with the whole heart. While he was praying, an angel sent from heaven came near and touched him. It was the same angel whom the prophet "had seen in the vision at the beginning"—i. e. not only in the vision recorded in chap. viii, but also that in chap. vii. He was sent at the beginning of the prophet's vi-

sions (and they commenced with chap. vii,) to interpret them. He came for the first time, chap. vii, seventeen years previous to this vision in chap. ix. He came a second time, chap. viii, two years after the first, and he comes now a third time, fifteen years after the second, and the next year after the death of Belshazzar. The prophet refers thus to him to identify him as the messenger sent again and again to reveal to him future events.

The angel introduces his prophetic message with the following words, vs. 22, 23,—"O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee: for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision." It is affirmed with singular assurance by those who teach the personal appearing of Christ A. D. 1843, that the words "the vision," in connection with the prophet's allusion to the angel as one whom he had "seen in the vision at the beginning," refer back to the vision in chap. viii; that the prophet not understanding it, the angel was sent to make clear to him what he did not understand, and that the only parts not before understood were the length of a day and when to commence the 2300 days. Accordingly they say that this prophecy of the 70 weeks was given to teach Daniel to commence the 2300 days of the previous vision in chap. viii. with "the going forth of the commandment" mentioned 9: 25. Now so far as the phrase "in the vision at the beginning" is concerned, it refers to chap. vii. rather than to chap. viii; for undoubtedly Gabriel was the angel who revealed to Daniel the events mentioned in chap. vii, and the phrase "at the beginning," like the words in 8: 1, "that which appeared unto me at the first," goes back to the first vision which is recorded in chap. vii. But not to dwell on this, let any plain man put these two visions side by side, and ask whether, on supposition that such were the points not understood by the prophet in the vision

in chap. viii, the angel's communication looks anything like a direct solution of them? Would any person in heaven above or in the earth beneath, that knew how to use language, so meet the points on which the mind of the prophet was supposed to be laboring?

There is a mode of speech in the first verse of chap. x, which is precisely like the one in question, and it will decide the point—"In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel . . . and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision." Now it is manifest that the vision mentioned 10: 1, refers to what the angel *is yet to say*, what the angel reveals in the verses following. So here in chap. ix. he says, "At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, [it literally reads *a thing was promulgated*, i. e. the matter of the following prophecy in vs. 24—27; for the word is the same with that translated "thing" in 10: 1,] and I am come to show thee; [the force of the original is that the angel came to show the thing to Daniel which had been promulgated in heaven;] therefore understand the matter [it is the same word translated "thing"], and consider the vision." Now as the phrase "the vision" in chap. x. refers to the "thing" mentioned in the first clause, and embraces the events which are related *afterwards*, so here in chap. ix. the same phrase "the vision" refers to the "thing" mentioned in the first clause of v. 23, and embraces not the events which have been related before, but the events which are related *afterwards* in vs. 24—27. So utterly without support is the argument which is made the very key-stone of the doctrine of the second advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, A. D. 1843. But see further on last clause but one of verse 24.

That all was clear to Daniel, no man in his senses would assert; but that the obscurity was in regard to when to commence the 2300 days, and that the angel came to clear up this, has not a shadow of support. The prophet doubtless

found it difficult to reconcile the events asserted both in chaps. vii. and viii, *with the promise of deliverance from captivity.* He supposed and hoped there would be no more such severe trials to go through. No wonder that after the lapse of fifteen or seventeen years from those two visions, and about the time of the end of the 70 weeks predicted as the period of the captivity, he became deeply solicitous for the result. The same angel who had communicated the knowledge of sad events yet to take place, and who had also promised that the kingdom should finally be given to the saints, appears again to him, to tell him how much longer time should elapse before the Great Deliverer, the Messiah should come, and he makes 70 *weeks* this appointed period, beginning with a specified event.

VERSE 24.

Seventy weeks.

This verse contains the summary of the events of the vision. It is the germ of which vs. 25—27 are the development. The first inquiry is, Are these weeks of days? Is this a period of time extending only a little beyond a year? Would Daniel and the Jews of his time so understand it? Can we who live in the light of history so understand it? There is in the original a peculiarity of phraseology, there is a figure of speech used which is called *paronomasia,* in which the words resemble each other in sense or *sound,* (they are here *shaw-voo-eém, shiv-eém,*) and when this figure is used it is indicative of peculiar emphasis or significancy. Now as the prophet Jeremiah had predicted that the Jews should be restored at the expiration of 70 years, and as Daniel made that promise the basis of his supplications, and the angel came while he was praying, such an announcement of 70 weeks or 70 *sevens,* with the peculiar significancy of the *paronomasia,* would naturally make the impression that 70

sevens of years were meant. Added to this, the announcement of such a chain of events, which could not haste to their accomplishment within the brief period of little more than a year, would secure Daniel and those for whom the prophecy was given, and every reader of it, against the limitation of the weeks to weeks of days. Some interpreters have found an argument for the weeks of years in a phrase in chap. 10: 2 translated "three full weeks;" which is literally *three weeks days*, and which they suppose implies that "weeks" had been used in the previous vision in the sense of *years*. But the grammatical construction is not "three weeks *of* days," and usage confirms the interpretation of the word *days*, in the original, as it is in our translation—"three *full* weeks"—or three weeks long, See Gen. 41: 1. Jer. 28: 3, 11, where it is literally *two years days*, i. e. two years long, or two years time—precisely the same sort of expression found in 10: 2.

But is there *any authority in the Scriptures* for reckoning these 70 weeks as weeks of years? Was there such a mode of reckoning time among the Jews. There was such a mode, and Daniel may well be supposed to be familiar with it. Among their directions in respect to the sabbatical year and year of jubilee, was the following; Lev. 25: 8, "And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years, seven times seven years; *and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years.*" The only difference between the two instances in Daniel and Leviticus is, that in the former it is *weeks* and in the latter it is *sabbaths*. But there is clear evidence that these two words *sabbaths* and *weeks* were used as synonymous, and interchanged with each other; for in Lev. 23: 15 it thus reads: "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, ... SEVEN SABBATHS shall be complete," and in Deut. 16: 9, where the same subject is spoken of, it reads, "Seven WEEKS shalt thou number unto thee." The reckoning therefore by sabbaths or weeks of

years was put down in the Jewish code of laws as one mode of computing time. It is not emblematical, as where Ezekiel is told to put days for years, nor what some have called prophetical, but it is an established mode of computing time. Nor was this usage confined to the Jews. Marcus Varro, a Roman writer born 116 years B. C., wrote some books which he called *Hebdomades*, (or Weeks,) in the first of which, having developed the significancy of the number 7, he says, that "he had now entered on the 11th hebdomad [or week] of years, and up to that day had written seventy *hebdomades* of books,"*—i. e. he was 11 times 7 years old, and was the author of 70 times 7 treatises. Another ancient author, Macrobius, who lived in the times of the Roman emperor Theodosius, and enjoyed much of the imperial patronage, says in commenting on Cicero's Dream of Scipio, "From the sixth to the seventh week there is a diminution of strength; but it is hidden, and does not manifest itself by any outward defect. Hence it was the custom in some republics not to oblige a man to go to the wars after the sixth week," i. e. after 42 years of age.† Here is the same phraseology that is used in the prophet Daniel, and though "years" in the first quotation is explicitly given, it is only in contrast with "books" in the other clause of the sentence, and is not added for the sake of explaining the meaning of the word "weeks."

One more inqury is, Are we to understand the 70 weeks of years as a period of 490 years—nor more nor less?‡ How

* Quoted in Rosenmüller's Commentary on Daniel, p. 207.

† Quoted in Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary on Daniel, chap. xi.

‡ Rosenmüller says, that "those labor in vain who try to make the 70 weeks, together with the deeds done during that space of time, conform to an exact and definite number of years," and he gives it as his opinion that "the number seventy was chosen by the author of the book merely on account of the *paronomasia* above mentioned; that the author did not wish them to be numbered so exactly as that there should be nothing redundant or deficient, and that they do not extend

can we understand it differently, if this is indeed a veritable, genuine prophecy, which most certainly it is? How can it be otherwise, if even a heathen writer uses similar phraseology in an exact, definite sense? How otherwise, since the 70 years were to be understood literally, and since all other periods of time thus far found in Daniel are to be understood literally? Would not Daniel so understand it? Is it not due to the prophecy to search carefully first of all for events in history to correspond with the events in the order and time of their occurrence here predicted? If there are such events to be found, corresponding with the period of their prediction, then we are to fix on them, and on no others; and their very peculiarity, and the peculiarity of the time specified, will place this prophecy among the very highest examples of prophetic inspiration.

Are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city.

Are determined is literally *are cut off*, viz. from any indefinite space of time, thence *are measured off, are determined.* The word is one of those found only once in the Bible.—*Upon thy people*, etc. i. e. over or for Daniel's countrymen and native city, Compare 11: 14, "Robbers of thy people," and 12: 1, "Children of thy people," also v. 20 of this same chapter, "While I was confessing the sin of my people Israel."

To finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness.

To finish the transgression is literally *to shut up the transgression*, (the definite article being in the original,) i. e. to restrain it and prevent its ravages.—"To make an end of sins," is literally to *seal up the sins.* The translation in the

beyond the times of Antiochus Epiphanes," Comm. on Daniel, pp. 320, 321—324. He however, as indeed all interpreters, makes the weeks *sevens of years*, though he discards precision in the use of the numbers 70, 7 and 62.

text seems to be the proper though secondary meaning in this place. The word denotes the finishing of sins and removing them out of sight, as by a seal a letter is closed and its contents shut up from view.—In the clause *to make reconciliation for iniquity*, the verb literally means *to cover*, and alludes to the mercy-seat—the *ilasterion*—the same "propitiation" mentioned in Romans 3: 25—which is derived from the verb "*to cover*." Christ crucified is the true propitiation. In him, as on the mercy-seat, God declares his mercy to the believing and penitent. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself not imputing their trespasses unto them," 1 Cor. 5: 19. The words *transgression*, and *sins*, and *iniquity*, refer to those acts of transgression which the prophet had been confessing in his prayer, vs. 5, 7, 11, etc., and not to the transgression mentioned in 8: 12, 13, 23. The general idea seems to be not that of filling up the measure of their iniquities, as in chap. viii, but that of the forgiveness and removal of sins.—"To bring in everlasting righteousness," means to introduce for God's people a permanent state of deliverance from sin, Comp. Dan. 11: 44, and 7: 27, "everlasting kingdom;" also Luke 1: 74, 75, "That he would grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life." Some translate the phrase, *the righteousness of ancient times;* but the context does not favor it.

And to seal up the vision and prophecy.

Literally, *to seal up vision and prophet.* To seal, is to close up and make fast with a seal—hence to make sure, to attest, confirm, fulfil; also to bring to a close or hide from view, as we have seen on the phrase "to make an end of sins." It must here denote *to make sure by fulfilling*, viz. what Daniel had seen in vision and what prophets had predicted. It may further teach that at the end of the seventy

weeks the Old Testament dispensation was to be brought to a close, was as it were to be sealed up and laid aside, even as it is said in Heb. 8: 13, "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." Nothing would seem plainer than that if the seventy weeks are the key to the 2300 days, and the angel was sent to tell the prophet when to begin them, then the seventy weeks finish the 2300 days, for the seventy weeks seal up the vision.*

And to anoint the Most Holy.

The designation "Most Holy," is the same with that rendered in the Scriptures *the holiest, the most holy place, the most holy things.* It is never applied in the Old Testament to persons, but only to places and things. In regard to the phrase "most holy place," i. e. the part of the temple within the vail, it varies somewhat from "Most Holy" in this verse, which last is the exact phrase translated elsewhere "most holy things," such as the altar of burnt-offering, the altar of incense, the ark, the table of shew-bread, the candlestick, the laver, etc. The signification "most holy" in this verse seems to be general, and borrowed from the whole tabernacle including its vessels which were anointed with the holy anointing oil, Exod. 30: 22—30. There is however a phrase used by the angel Gabriel in announcing the birth of Jesus

* Mr. Wm. Miller, Lectures, p. 62, renders the word "to *seal* up," to make *sure, certain, unalterable.* He gives only this one definition of the word. Of course it has not this meaning in the clause "to seal up the sins," which he takes rightly in the sense of *putting away*, but which he does not seem to know is the same word with that in the phrase "to seal up the vision and prophecy." Nor can this word have this meaning of "making sure," in Rev. 20: 10, "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book." The seventy weeks however "make sure" the vision by *fulfilling* it, and if the vision of the 2300 days were meant, the seventy weeks would of course close them up and end them.

to Mary, which might justify the application of the phrase "Most Holy" to our Savior,—"Therefore that most holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," Luke 1: 35. Nevertheless, as this use of "most holy," is not found in the Old Testament Scriptures, it may be more legitimately applied to describe the establishment of the purer worship of the Father taught by our Savior the Messiah—the building up of the Christian Church on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, Eph. 2: 20—the consecration of the sanctuary and true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man, Heb. 8: 2—the endowment of those who constitute the true Church of Christ with the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit. Can such declarations as these mean anything short of the gospel dispensation? Who does not at once feel the inadequacy of the interpretation given by Rosenmüller and others, that the prediction is bounded by the times of Antiochus Epiphanes as the most remote limits, and that it denotes "the end of the exile with which God would punish the contumacy of the Jews; the fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy concerning the Captivity, and the dedication of the temple and restoration of sacred worship?" If this verse 24 applies to Christ, and to the gospel dispensation set up subsequently to his death; if the 24th verse is, as before remarked, the summary of the vision, and the other verses its unfolding and explanation, then must vs. 25—27 refer likewise to the same.

Verse 25.

Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem.

Here without question commence the 70 weeks. What and when was this commandment. There was a promise made to Jeremiah, 29: 10, (Comp. also 25: 11, 12,) about

598 B. C., "Thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word to you, in causing you to return to this place." This, as Rosenmüller and others suppose, was "the commandment."

Again, there was a commandment issued by Cyrus, in his first year, 536 B. C. It was predicted by Isaiah 44: 28, "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid."—This commandment is recorded as matter of history in Ezra i, and consequent upon it was the return of 50,000 Jews out of Babylon to their native land.

There are yet other points of time. The work of rebuilding Jerusalem, which was commenced in the first year of Cyrus, was obstructed and interrupted through the malice of the surrounding people, until Darius the son of Hystaspes, 520 B. C., issued a decree in favor of the Jews, when the work of the temple was resumed, and dedicated 515 B. C., Ezra 6: 7—12.

Subsequent to this was a decree by Artaxerxes Longimanus, in the 7th year of his reign, which many chronologists fix at 457 B. C. This decree was carried to Jerusalem by Ezra, who was also accompanied by a large number of the Jews that had not before returned; and when the decree was handed to the king's officers in the land, "they furthered the people and the house of God."

There was still another decree given in the 20th year of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah. The walls had until that time remained in the state in which they were left by Nebuchadnezzar—"broken down, and the gates thereof burned with fire," and the people were "in great affliction and reproach," Neh. 1: 3. When Nehemiah who was at that time cup-bearer to the king heard this, he set himself to fasting and prayer, as Daniel also had done; and having first prayed that God would

give him mercy in the sight of Artaxerxes, he asked and obtained letters patent that he might be sent to the city of his fathers' sepulchres to build it, and be furnished with timber for the gates of the temple, and the wall of the city, Neh. ii. From that period the walls of the city went forward until they were completed. Under the auspices of Nehemiah both church and state were greatly reformed, Jerusalem was better inhabited, "the people being few therein" up to that time, "and the houses not builded," Neh. 7: 4. There would seem to be an adequate reason in these circumstances for dating "the commandment to restore Jerusalem" at this point of time. Did the commandment however issue from God, or from an earthly source? Doubtless the former, though not excluding human instrumentality—even as God said of Cyrus, Is. 44: 28, as above quoted, He shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid. According to the usual chronology, Artaxerxes began his reign 464 or 465 B. C.; and the twentieth year of his reign according to this would be 445 or 446 B. C. But by other chronologists, and by Calmet among the number, the twentieth year of Artaxerxes was in the year of the world 3550; 454 years before Christ's actual birth allowing for Calmet's computation that Christ was not born until 4004 years from the creation of the world.

With these several points of time in view, (which are the only ones given in history, and the only ones assumed in all and any of the various interpretations given to this vision,) we come now to definite periods within the seventy weeks.

Unto the Messiah the Prince.

These two words are each without the definite article, and by some, as by Rosenmüller, they are translated *an anointed Prince*, the word *Messiah* being taken as an *adjective*—which

it often is; and though the Hebrew usage has generally in a phrase thus translated the adjective placed *after* the noun, and not as it is here *before* it in construction, yet there are exceptions to this general rule, as Is. 53: 11, *my righteous servant*, Gen. 17: 14, *uncircumcised man child*, and therefore such a translation would have its sanction in the Scriptures, and may be the true one. Admit it to be the true one, (*an anointed one, a prince*,—would be more correct,) yet the individual may have been as distinctly presented by the angel before the prophet's mind, as if he had used the article. We have only to suppose that the prophet has here the previous vision of the fifth kingdom in his mind as recorded in chap. vii, "Behold one like the Son of man came .... and there was given him a kingdom,"—and the appellation *an anointed prince* would be perfectly definite to him. He would at once identify him with the one he saw in that vision; and it is not unworthy of notice that the very phrase "one like the Son of man" is in the original as indefinite as *an anointed prince* here. But the translation as it stands in our version has the suffrage and approbation of one of the most distinguished Hebrew scholars now living,* who thus remarks,—"The translation is correct and in accordance with the principle that the prophet or poet frequently omits the article even where the noun must be regarded as definite. In Daniel's vivid description of the vision he likewise omits the article before other nouns where the prose writer would be required to use it, as they are undoubtedly definite—for instance in the expression "the going forth of the commandment," the word "commandment" is without the article. Hence the words *unto the Messiah* are left without the article not because the prophet wishes to make his statement indefinite, but because its definiteness is so clear and obvious before his excited mind, that he considers it unnecessary to point it out by means of the article."

* Prof. Nordheimer in his letter to Prof. Stuart, Bib. Repos. Oct. 1841.

Some have also found difficulty in the use of the word translated "prince" to denote the Messiah, because it is of various and secondary signification, when if the angel had meant the Messiah he would have used the appellation "the king," as the appropriate word.* But the word "prince" is every way expressive. It is found 11: 22, applied to the high-priest "prince of the covenant" and in 1 Sam. 13: 14, applied to David as the king of Israel, "The Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be captain over his people." Its primary idea is that of being *first, excellent*, in which last signification it is used in Prov. 8: 6, "Hear, for I will speak of excellent things." It is more expressive and larger in signification than the word *king*, for that is employed only in the sense of *ruling*. And to decide the point beyond question, the appellation "prince of peace" is given to the Messiah, Is. 9: 6, where though a *different* word is used, it is as secondary as this in Dan. 9: 25.

Who then is designated by "the Messiah the Prince?" The consideration already alluded to, that the prophet had the vision of the fifth kingdom in his mind, will be more particularly remarked on in the sequel of this section. The periods of time annexed will now do much toward determining the question.

Shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times.

Between the clauses "seven weeks" and "threescore and two weeks" there is in the original a pause-accent of the largest kind, and this has been made the ground of separating the two clauses, and assigning the first seven weeks as the period at whose close the anointed prince above mentioned should come, and the next threescore and two weeks

* Prof. Stuart in Letter to Prof. Nordheimer, Bib. Repos. Oct. 1841.

as the period during which the street and wall should be built again, and Jerusalem restored to its pristine condition. But (1) the same pause-accent sometimes occurs in the midst of a sentence where to separate the parts of the sentence is grammatically impossible. For instance in Gen. 1: 1, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," this same pause-accent is between the words *created* and *the heaven*. While this accent may generally mark the divisions of sense, it with the others may only direct the chanting, or *recitativo* reading of the Hebrew Scriptures in public worship.

(2) It is contrary to fact and absurd to suppose that "the street and wall" were 62 weeks or 434 years in being rebuilt; nor even on the interpretation of those who synchronize the expiration of the 62 weeks with the death of Alexander, can it be supposed that the city was not restored as here mentioned until B. C. 324—one hundred and nineteen years subsequent to the last decree, bringing down that decree as late as possible.

(3) The expiration of the seven weeks from either of the above mentioned dates assigned to the several decrees or commandments for restoring Jerusalem, brings us to no "prince" then "anointed." It does not bring us to Cyrus, whom Rosenmüller and others suppose to be designated; though indeed this consideration touches not them, because they arbitrarily disregard all precision of time in accounting for the seven weeks. From the taking of Babylon 538 B. C., or from Cyrus' sole reign 536 B. C., 49 years carry us back only to 587 or 585 B. C., which was twelve or thirteen years *after* the word of promise mentioned Jer. 29: 10, the date which Rosenmüller fixes on; so that his first term of time falls short by 13 years, and he makes the seven weeks equivalent to *sixty-two* years instead of forty-nine. Cyrus is indeed called the "anointed" of God, Is. 45: 1; but this title being given him by one prophet, is no proof that another prophet means the

same person when he uses the word "anointed;" and it is certain that there was no other "commandment" between him and the promise given to Jeremiah.

(4) The same anointed prince seems manifestly spoken of soon after as coming at the close not of the seven weeks, but of the 62 weeks following the seven, viz. v. 26—"and after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off." The application of "Messiah" mentioned v. 26, to Alexander the Great, or to Onias, etc., will be noticed in the proper place. But if the two are identical, then the seven weeks and threescore and two weeks together designate one period and are not to be separated in the construction in which they stand, but are to be joined together in order to mark the point of time when the anointed prince was to come. From the date of the decree to his coming were to be 69 weeks or 483 years. The expression is indeed peculiar, and there may not be found in the Bible a phrase exactly in the form of this to denote a definite number, but no usage opposes it. The Hebrew has many anomalies greater than this, it has its peculiar phrases and these found only in one instance, and the context is often the sole guide to their meaning. Let the reader however weigh this phrase, and ask whether in itself it seems harsh and contrary to the analogy of language? Let him decide between this unusual employment of numbers, (if it seems unusual,) and the more unusual and harsh disregard of the numbers 70, and 7, and 62, which those show who nevertheless insist upon ascertained and definite usage in regard to the clause in question.

But the designation of 7 weeks, or 49 years, along with the 62 weeks, was to mark the time employed in the rebuilding of the wall and city, and this furnishes a sufficient solution of the peculiarity of the phrase as a mode of designating time. When Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem, as above mentioned, the city was thinly inhabited, and its walls were yet in ruins. They raised the walls that same year by

unparalleled exertions, (though it appears from Josephus that two years more were occupied in completing them,) their enemies conspiring for their defeat and showing open hostility, so that a part were obliged to stand in armor for the protection of those who labored on the walls, and the laborers themselves, while they wrought with one hand, held a weapon in the other.* This speedy erection of the walls was because "the people had a mind to work," Neh. 4: 6; and when the walls were once raised as a shield of defence, they could proceed more regularly. The word *wall* is however in the original *moat* or *ditch*, and such is the marginal reading. The moat implies the wall. The *street* was the open place prepared for the people to assemble in a sort of *forum*, as was the custom in oriental cities, Comp. Neh. 8: 1, "And all the people gathered themselves together as one man in the street before the water-gate," probably the gate through which the people of the city went to the brook Kedron. But as yet "the houses were not builded," Neh. vii, nor were things restored to their former regular condition. Nehemiah remained twelve years, (Neh. 13: 6,) but it appears that he had not been able fully to restore matters. After some space of time, it is not said how long, he went up again and reformed abuses still existing. There is no further record of him, or of the work of restoration, in the Bible; but Josephus relates that he died at a very advanced age, and it is altogether probable that the work begun by him and carried on for many years, required as long a space as the seven weeks or 49 years for its completion. The clause "the street shall be built again, etc." is of the same import with "to restore and to build Jerusalem," and the preparation of the street or fo-

* Michaelis objecting to the application of the seven weeks of years to the rebuilding of Jerusalem, says that the Jews enjoyed peace, and were in a tolerable state of things for the first 49 years, under Artaxerxes (who lived 30 years after his decree) and under Darius Nothus (who reigned 19 years); but this is in the very face of facts.

rum for judicial transactions and purposes of buying and selling, seems a summary declaration of the full restoration of their former flourishing municipal state.

Verse 26.

And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off.

We come now to the *sixty-two* weeks following the seven, or 483 years in all from issuing the commandment. At the expiration of this period the Messiah should be cut off, i. e. come to a violent death. The first and most natural impression certainly is, that Messiah v. 26, must be the same with Messiah v. 25;* for if *two different* persons were meant, there would be something like the phrase "one other" in 11: 5 to show it, but there is no such mark of distinction. The two are one and the same unless there is something in the context to make it impossible; and we shall see there is nothing, and that both must refer solely to our Lord Jesus Christ.

Rosenmüller having applied the designation "Messiah," v. 25 to Cyrus, applies this in v. 26 to Alexander the Great, Comm. p. 323. But as Alexander was cut off 324 B. C., this makes the date of the commandment 808 B. C., 218 years before the commandment or promise, (Jer. xxix, 598 B. C.,) and reduces the 69 weeks or 483 years to only 274 years at most (598—324=274); and the reasons he assigns are that Alexander's death makes a conspicuous epoch between Cyrus and Antiochus Epiphanes, and that as Alexander is mentioned chaps. ii, vii, viii, and xi, it is incredible he should be passed over in chap. ix.

Others suppose Onias to be meant who was cut off in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, or the abolition of the high-priesthood at the time of the taking away of the daily sacrifice; but this is equally without regard to precision of time

* So Prof. Nordheimer considers them, See his letter to Prof. Stuart, p. 417.

in the periods mentioned; for from 171 B. C., the time when Onias was cut off, 483 years would extend back to 654 B. C., 56 years before the earliest date fixed on by any for the going forth of the commandment. Neither of these applications is admissible, on any consideration of the weeks as portions of time reckoned by fixed laws, and in a regular manner; and to Rosenmüller's interpretation there exists the objection that he makes the prophecy destitute of all proportion in the divisions of time—stretching the first seven weeks to *twelve or thirteen years more* than the forty-nine years, and from the sixty-nine weeks *cutting off full two hundred and seventy-four years*. Rosenmüller objects to an interpretation by Eichhorn, (which to be sure is arbitrary enough; for from the decree of Cyrus granted to the Jews, he reckons *backward* to *Nebuchadnezzar* as the anointed prince, and then *forward* to Onias the high-priest as the anointed one cut off,) Rosenmüller objects to this that Eichhorn takes many things at will, and disregards all established usage in computing the years of any definite epoch, Commentary, p. 322. But certainly the same objection lies as strong against his own method, and against every method which makes the computation of the 69 weeks fall so far short of that number of sevens of years.*

If not to Cyrus, nor to Alexander, nor to Onias, the appellations "the Messiah the Prince" and "Messiah" can be applied, then who is the individual thus definitely announced by the angel, and presented to the prophet's mind? Where can we look but to Jesus? If the 483 years can with any high degree of probability, much more with comparative certainty,

* Another interpretation is found in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, B. i. c. 6; viz. that it denotes the abolition of the sacred unction among the Jews, i. e. of the succession of the high priests, and that the prophecy was fulfilled about the time of our Lord's birth, in the arbitrary appointment of priests by Herod no longer from ancient lineage, but from obscure individuals. But usage is entirely against making "anointed" the designation of an *office*.

be shown to extend from the issuing of one of the edicts above mentioned to a period in the life of Christ analogous to the anointing of a prince, then is the prophecy intended of him alone.

At the age of about 30, he was anointed with the Holy Ghost at his baptism, and thenceforth was he the publicly commissioned Son of God. Though he was not made both Lord and Christ, until he had been crucified and had risen from the dead, (Acts 2: 36,) yet was he the anointed Prince as David was the king anointed over Israel by Samuel even before he ascended the throne, 1 Sam. xvi; and it was fit the Son of David should in this respect be like his prototype and ancestor according to the flesh. Now with the decree in the 20th year of Artaxerxes as the date of the going forth of the commandment, according to Calmet's chronology 454 years before the actual birth of Christ, 483 years give us *twenty-nine* years as the age of our Lord at his anointing or baptism—which corresponds exactly with the fact mentioned in connexion with his baptism, Luke 3: 23, "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age."

There is a mode of reckoning by Hengstenberg* on this point, worthy of particular notice. He shows with a good degree of probability that Artaxerxes began to reign not in the year 465 B. C., as most chronologists suppose, but in 474 B. C. Deduct 19 from this as coinciding with the 20th year of his reign when Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem, and it gives 455 B. C. This last date coincides with the year from the foundation of Rome 299. Add 483 to this, and it

* See his Christology, Dr. Keith's Translation, Vol. II. pp. 394, etc. The reader will find a most elaborate dissertation occupying 130 octavo pages, on this vision of the Seventy Weeks—a dissertation which though some of its positions are untenable, and its arguments wire-drawn to an extreme, will richly repay perusal, and in its general results agrees with the interpretation here given of chap. ix, though differing in particulars and mode of discussion.

gives the year 782 of Rome, which was *the fifteenth year of Tiberius*. On this very year, according to Luke 3: 1, John began to baptize. Jesus appeared about six months afterward, being thus much younger than his herald. To him as "the Messiah the Prince," and to the very event of his receiving the divine unction, the period of 483 years "from the going forth of the commandment," just extends.

According to the Chronology of Dr. Hales, the decree must be that given to Ezra in the 7th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. He fixes that period as 457 B. C., and as he assigns the actual birth of Christ to the fifth year, or four entire years, *before* the common era of "Anno Domini," it would reduce the 457 to 452 or 453 B. C. Deducting this from 483, (the years in the 69 weeks at the close of which the Messiah the Prince was to appear,) and it gives 30 years as the age when Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost at his baptism. This whole subject of chronology is much perplexed by the discrepancies in the results of learned men who have devoted much time and pains to it. Whether Dr. Hales', or Dr. Hengstenberg's, is the true reckoning may be matter of question. The former has the difficulty in it, that no satisfactory reason seems to present itself why the commandment to Ezra should be made the point from which to reckon, and that others seem before it in importance. Some considerations on these discrepancies are reserved for the sequel.*

The above considerations which identify the Anointed Prince with our Lord Jesus Christ are further confirmed by the declaration, *shall Messiah be cut off*, i. e. shortly after his being anointed he should come to a violent end. And thus it was with Jesus. Not more than three years elapsed after he received the sacred unction when he was "taken and by wicked hands was crucified and slain." Or the idea may be

* See also the learned investigation of Prideaux on the Seventy Weeks, Vol. 1. pp. 227—254.

that shortly after he should be anointed, he should be *cut off from the throne*, Comp. 1 Sam. 2: 33. 1 Kings 2: 4. 9: 5. 2 Chron. 7: 18. Jer. 33: 17, 18, where the same word translated "cut off," (Dan. ix,) is found in such connexions as the following: "the man whom I shall not cut off from mine altar"—"there shall not fail thee [the same word translated *cut off*] a man on the throne of Israel." Jesus after being anointed, and introduced to the city with shouts of "Hosanna to the Son of David," and benedictions of "Blessed is the king of Israel," was cut off suddenly from the earthly throne of David, and with him perished the expectations the people had been cherishing. Comp. Is. 53: 8, "He was cut off out of the land of the living."

But not for himself.

If this translation is retained, it reads in full, *But [he shall] not [be cut off] for himself*, and it expresses the sentiment that the Messiah should not die for his own sins, but for man's—not so much for his own advantage, as for those who believing should have life through his name. This sentiment is indeed a great truth explicitly taught in the Scriptures, but it is an objection to such a translation here, that the original phraseology as found elsewhere cannot be so translated and is not—for instance, Lev. 11: 10, "All that have not" is a similar phrase, and guided by analogy the phrase in question must be translated, *And shall have nothing*.* That is,

* This is the translation given in the margin by our English translators. The negative particle in the text as it stands, translated "not," is the one more generally translated *no* and *nothing*; it is an *adjective*, or a *noun*, *not the adverb* corresponding to our adverb *not*. Gesenius however gives the word as simply equivalent in many instances to *not*, but in one of those he specifies it is translated in our version *no*,—"no straw given," Ex. 5: 16, and in all the others it may better so be translated, or by the other word *nothing*—as in Gen. 37: 29, "Joseph was not in the pit," it had better read, There was no Joseph in the

the angel conveys the idea to the prophet's mind, that the Messiah should not literally restore the kingdom to Israel, should not be literally a king occupying the throne which his father David occupied. The angel announced to Daniel the fact of Christ's *spiritual* kingdom, and would have him divest his mind of those ideas which the literal interpretation of the language respecting the fifth kingdom would give, and which even Christ's disciples after his death so fondly cherished, of the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, Acts 1: 6. Though the Messiah should come, Jerusalem should be destroyed, not revived; the material temple razed to the ground, not built up in more glory; the earthly kingdom utterly abolished, not established. And this the angel goes on to assert in the words following.

And [but] the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

Can this desolation be, as Rosenmüller and others affirm, the desolation by Antiochus Epiphanes predicted in 11: 31—35. 8: 10—13, and 7: 21, 25? Can "the war" be the war between Antiochus Epiphanes and the Jews? Certainly

---

pit; and in Esther 7: 4, "The enemy could not countervail the king's damage," it is better thus: The enemy could in nothing countervail the king's damage. The strongest instance in favor of Gesenius' position is Dan. 8: 5, "And he touched not the ground," but even here it accords with usage to say, And in nothing touched he the ground. The difference of meaning is not great, but it goes to show that in Hebrew usage the word translated "not," in the clause in question, is never used as an adverb to qualify a verb or some other word, and therefore cannot be translated, And he shall not be cut off for himself. Rosenmüller gives it as the sense—He shall no more be found among the living. Others make it elliptical, and translate it, He shall have no helper, or, There shall be no deliverance to him. Hengstenberg translates it, "And is not to him," in the sense that his dominion shall be destroyed.

not, if the period of time is to be interpreted with any regard to precision; for as that desolation took place 168 B. C., even the sixty-nine weeks (or sixty-nine and a half, See next verse) would carry us back to 655 B. C., fifty-six years earlier than the date which Rosenmüller assumes as the going forth of the commandment, Jer. xxix. The sixty-nine and a half weeks dating from that commandment about 598 B. C., would reach to 111 B. C., fifty-three years after Antiochus' death. If not the desolation by Antiochus Epiphanes, then it must be that by Titus Vespasian, whose people, the Roman armies, destroyed the city A. D. 70, and burned the temple with fire though Vespasian had issued his prohibition of the deed, and afterwards made most strenuous efforts to quench the flames. The time when this deed should be done is not limited to the sixty-nine or seventy weeks; the scope of the prophecy is only that it shall take place *after* their expiration—after the Messiah should be cut off; and it did thus take place in less than forty years after he was cut off. The account which Josephus gives of the calamities of that period is a most wonderful fulfilment of the prophecy, See his history of the Wars of the Jews, Bks. v.—vii. Disease, famine, and slaughter followed in fearful succession among the multitudes who had collected together in the city from all quarters and were celebrating the passover at the time the siege commenced. Eleven hundred thousand perished, and ninety-seven thousand* were made captives, of whom hundreds were put to the tortures of the cross. And so complete and terrible was the devastation, that one passing by would have supposed the place had never been inhabited. Thus was the end of the sanctuary and city as with a flood, (though the suffix pronoun translated "thereof," i. e. of it, is in the singular number, it may by usage refer to two antecedents which are each in the singular number,) and wave after wave of desolation rolled over that devoted land and people unto the end of the war. Confirmatory of this

* Probably these numbers are somewhat exaggerated.

application to the Roman prince Titus Vespasian, is the manner in which he is here introduced. It is just similar to 11: 18, "A prince for his own behalf," etc., and again 11: 30, "The ships of Chittim shall come against him." The word "prince," is the same in v. 26 as in v. 25; but what is said of each sufficiently distinguishes them.

Verse 27.

And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.

The Messiah is the principal antecedent, to which the word "he" must refer, as indeed almost all acknowledge, and its remoteness from the personal pronoun is in accordance with usage in manifold places. Rosenmüller, (Comm. pp. 309, 323,) who applies the prophecy to Antiochus, considers it as fulfilled in his having been indirectly the means of attaching the Jews more firmly to their religion, Comp. 11: 32—35. Others (quoted by Rosenmüller p. 324,) apply it to the understanding Antiochus had with apostate Jews, Comp. 11: 30, 32. To the latter, Rosenmüller well objects that usage is wholly against it; for the word translated "covenant," throughout Daniel means the covenant of God with his people.* To Rosenmüller's application the objection is equally valid that it is against usage; for such a sentence can only mean that the prince alluded to directly established the covenant of God with his people, and compared with what is said of Antiochus Epiphanes that he should "have indignation against the holy covenant," affords the most conclusive argument that the prophecy cannot apply to Antiochus and his times. It applies to our Lord Jesus Christ alone, the Mediator of the new covenant—"the new covenant," mentioned by Jer. 31: 31—34 and illustrated in Heb. viii.—the new covenant as affirmed by our Lord himself—"This cup is the new testament in my blood." He confirmed the covenant with

* See Interpretation, p. 33.

many [Heb. the many], by granting to those who believed on him the privilege and power to be called the sons of God; by fulfilling the rich promises of God; by establishing a more spiritual religion in the heart; by working wonderful miracles and shedding the influences of the Holy Spirit; a work, which commencing with his public ministry at the close of the sixty-nine weeks, continued after his resurrection during the forty days he showed himself alive to his disciples, and reached beyond the Pentecost as far as the time when the believers were dispersed from Jerusalem to found churches in other cities, "and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord." This period does not more than carry us through the last week of the seventy; and it contains events adequately fulfilling the declaration in the first clause of this verse. It brings us up to the time when the covenant having been confirmed among God's people the Jews, was afterwards extended also to the Gentiles.

And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.

The words *midst* and *week* having the article in the original, by connection manifestly refer to the same "one week" previously mentioned. The word *the midst*, is in the original *the half*—a word which in the Hebrew, as we have seen, and indeed in every language, often denotes not an *exact* half, See Interpretation, p. 128. The sense may simply be that on the first half portion of the week the event herein predicted should take place. The Epistle to the Hebrews contains the true explanation, chap. 10: 8—10, "When he said, sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein, which are offered by the law; Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God:—he taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." This too

was signified at the death of Jesus on the cross, by the rending asunder of the vail of the temple. And well has Calvin said, "the rending of the vail, was not only an abrogation of the Jewish rites and ceremonies, but an opening of the heavens as though God now invited the members of his Son to himself. In the meantime the Jews were admonished that an end had now come to external sacrifices; that there would now be no more occasion for the service of the priests, and that the very image of the shadows having been now completed, the legal types were converted into spiritual substance," Quoted in Hengstenberg, p. 359.

And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate [*marginal reading*, And upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator.]

If the reading of the text is retained, it means either that the overspreading of abominations *by the wicked Jews* was the *cause* why the city and sanctuary were made desolate, or that the city and sanctuary were desolated, in order to be overspread with abominations by the Gentiles. The translation in the text, however, has no sanction whatever from Hebrew usage in any other part of the Bible, and it is not to be retained unless the context absolutely demands it—which it does not. Better the translation in the margin, and it is substantially that which will now be given. The clause may literally read, *Upon the wing* [*of the temple*] *shall be the abominations that make desolate.* The word *wing* is the word above translated "overspreading" and "battlements." The phrase translated in the text, "abominations he shall make it desolate," is like 11: 31, "the abomination that maketh desolate," only *abomination* in the latter is in the *singular* number, and in the former it is in the *plural.* The word translated "that maketh desolate" and "he shall make it desolate," is the same in both cases, and is in form a participle or participial.

As to the word *wing*, its construction in the sentence is peculiar and makes all the difficulty. It seems to govern the following word *abominations* in the genitive case; hence the translation in the text, "overspreading of abominations." But though the construction is peculiar, it is like that of many Hebrew words which have a noun after them *implied*, not expressed, and is here to be taken as the wing *of the temple*, as in Ps. 74: 19, where our translators have supplied the words *of the wicked*, after "multitude," which has precisely the same grammatical form with *wing*. Compare the expression "pinnacle [literally wing] of the temple," Matt. 4: 5.

As to the *participle* singular united to a plural noun, the word "abominations" seems to be what is called *the plural of excellence*, which commonly takes a participle or adjective in the singular. As for instance in Is. 19: 4, "a cruel lord" is exactly the same sort of phrase with *abominations that make desolate*, only the latter has a participle or participial instead of an adjective—which makes no difference in principle. Or if it be not a *plural of excellence*, the construction which unites a common plural with a participle or participial in the singular is found also in other places as in Gen. 27: 29, "Cursed be every one that curseth thee," literally, Cursed be *the cursers of thee*.*

* There is no objection to the translation *abominations of the desolator*, except that the corresponding phrase in Matt. 24: 15, reads *abomination of desolation*, i. e. *that maketh desolate;* and the Hebrew Dan. 9: 27 may so read in harmony with usage and the laws of grammar. Gesenius in his lexicon gives the translation *desolator* both in 9: 27 and 11: 31; but supports it by no other authority, and in the very paragraph with the signification *destroyer*, he classes it with another which allows the word in Dan. 9: 27 to be joined with abominations in the sense of making desolate, i. e. desolating abominations. Hengstenberg gives the interpretation, "And over the summit of abomination comes the destroyer," taking the word "abomination" in the sense of the temple desecrated by the abominations of the Jews, and the whole phrase as asserting that the enemy mastered the highest battlements of the temple, and when this was done virtually pos-

The question arises, Was there anything in the history of the destruction of Jerusalem which corresponded to this prophecy, "On the wing of the temple shall be the abominations that make desolate?" It is related by Josephus that the Roman soldiers having brought their battering-rams to the embankments they had raised over against the western edifice of the inner temple, some of them by means of ladders ascended the cloisters round the temple with the Roman standards in their hands, though they were met and driven back with great havoc by the Jews. They then set fire to the gates. Early the next day, Titus with his whole army encamped round about the holy house. The fire was now consuming the inner court of the temple, from which a soldier communicated it with his own hands to a golden window leading to the rooms round about the holy house, and the fire raged now still more widely. Another soldier shortly set fire to the gate, and the fire then burst out from within the holy house, and raged until nothing but the walls were left stand-

sessed the whole. But his interpretation better shows his ingenuity than illustrates the text, and has more foundation in his own fancy than in usage, and he tries in vain satisfactorily to harmonize it with the words of Christ. He makes it an objection that Christ is made to designate a moment for flight precisely when it is too late. But it is to be observed that Christ does not give the signal for escape from *Jerusalem* only, but from *Judea*. So difficult was it for the Jews to believe the temple would be destroyed, that even those *would linger around the city* who were not shut up in it, and our Savior accordingly warned his disciples not to linger but to *flee out of Judea entirely*; for if they remained in the neighborhood of the city they would perish. The sign for them *that the desolation of the city was near*, was when the Roman armies should compass it, and history records the fact that the disciples remained in the city until that time, and then had an opportunity to escape on a transient retiring of the Roman forces. *The sign for them to flee entirely out of Judea*, was when they should see the abomination of desolation stand in the holy place. *This they could behold from the Mount of Olives, even after they had escaped from the city; and doubtless they lingered until they saw it.*

ing. When the holy house was burnt, and all the buildings round about it, the Romans brought their standards to the temple, *and set them over its eastern gate; and there offered sacrifices to them.* Here were the desolating abominations, those idol-standards of eagles by which the Romans effected their desolations—here they stood on or near the wing of the temple—here were idolatrous sacrifices offered up, as Antiochus formerly offered up the sacrifice of swine's flesh, (Hengstenberg says the story about his setting up the statue of Jupiter is a fiction, *Christology*, p. 371,) which were the sign and seal that thenceforth the temple and city should be desolate.

Even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

For desolate some read *desolator*, and thus it is in the margin of the English version. But the same grammatical form (which is a participle of another form of the same verb in the phrase *abominations that make desolate*) is found in vs. 18, 26 of this same chapter where it must be taken in the *passive* sense of *being desolated*, and this sense is agreeable to usage. The meaning is that Jerusalem should lie desolate and her sanctuary remain polluted until what was determined in the counsels of God should be poured upon her—a prophecy how wonderfully fulfilled, and its truth attested more and more strongly as the eighteen hundred years since its desolation have successively passed away!

Having thus gone through with the particulars of this prophecy, a few additional considerations will close its interpretation and confirm the views already presented. To this prophecy, if to any in the book of Daniel, does our Savior refer, Matt. 24: 15. Mark 13: 14. Luke 21: 20,—"When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand:) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." In Mark it reads—"standing where

it ought not," the phrase "holy place" given by Matthew having been probably uttered by our Savior in connection with "standing where it ought not." In Luke it reads, "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which be in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto." The words given by Luke do not seem so much explanatory of the phrase "abomination of desolation" as an accession to the meaning, and were probably uttered by our Lord before that phrase, the entire observation being as follows—"When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, and the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet stand in the holy place, where it ought not, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh; then let them which be in Judea flee to the mountains." As we have seen, there the idol-standards of eagles stood in the holy place, where they ought not, and it was not one but *many* abominations, literally answering to the *plural* form of the word as found in v. 27. When these things should be seen, then let none look for safety anywhere in Judea, anywhere in the vicinity of Jerusalem, but flee to the distant mountains. And history records the fact that the disciples fled beyond Jordan out of Judea to Pella, when Jerusalem was besieged and destroyed. Now do these words of our Savior admit of any explanation on the principle of *accommodation?* Is it not a direct reference to a veritable prophecy of the final destruction of Jerusalem? How can it consistently be construed otherwise? And then just after his reference to the prophecy there is his language Luke 21: 22—24, "For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled .... and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled"—until what was appointed to be poured upon her by the hands of the Gentiles should be all fulfilled in

the set time allotted for their destructive work. Now if the context in Daniel absolutely forbade the application to Jerusalem; if such an application could be made only by violating the usage of the Scriptures, we should indeed be compelled to regard our Savior as arguing on some erroneous interpretation of the Jews, or as using the words of the prophecy with such an application as he himself chose to make at the time; but such an alternative would seem to be at the expense of our being entirely set adrift as to any firm persuasion of the reality of such a thing as prophecy. No such alternative however are we compelled to adopt. Usage sanctions and the prophecy demands the general interpretation we have given, and the application which is made of it by our Lord himself.

The same application which our Savior made of it, is also made by Josephus after the destruction of Jerusalem, and confirmed as it is by our Savior, may well be relied on—"In the very same manner Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them," Antiq. B. x. ch. 11. sec. 7; and (as Rosenmüller justly remarks, p. 314) to that desolation no other prediction in the book of Daniel refers except in these two last verses of chap. ix. There is also another passage in his History of the Wars of the Jews, B. iv. ch. 6. sec. 3, (which, as Rosenmüller acknowledges, shows that this application was made by the Jews of Josephus' time, and he also says the Jews of the present day retain it as the true one,)—"They [the Zealots] occasioned the fulfilling of those very prophecies belonging to their own country; for there was a certain ancient oracle of those men [the prophets] that the city should then be taken and the sanctuary burnt, by right of war, when a sedition should invade the Jews, and their own hand pollute the temple of God. Now while these Zealots did not disbelieve these predictions, they made themselves the instruments of their accomplishment."

The main argument insisted on by Rosenmüller against the application of this prophecy to Christ and to the final destruction of Jerusalem, is certainly as valid against himself. It has already been alluded to in the remark quoted from him that "it is altogether incredible that Alexander, who is mentioned in the other prophecies, (2: 40. 7: 6. 8: 5, 6, and 11: 3,) should be omitted here in chapter ninth." So may it be urged that it is incredible the kingdom of the Messiah which is mentioned in all the other prophecies, chap. viii. excepted, (for we shall see that it is mentioned, and Rosenmüller admits it, in chap. xii,) should be omitted here in chap. ix. Rosenmüller's argument at length (Commentary, p. 318) is, "that the prophetic part of Daniel embracing the six last chapters contains *four* visions, three of which, the first, second and fourth [in chaps. vii, viii, and xi,] denote the same things but in different ways; that in those visions the revolutions of the reigns of Eastern Asia are predicted from the Chaldean reign down to the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, regard being had particularly to the affairs of the Jews; that the argument of those three visions is the same, and they shed mutual light on each other; that what things are briefly explained in the first, are next explained more clearly and explicitly, and the fourth is as it were the *epexegesis* [the interpretation added by the writer] of the preceding; that therefore we must conclude that this vision in chap. ix, the third of the four, pertains to the same events with the remaining three." But surely the argument is as valid, that since the kingdom of the Messiah is mentioned in two of these four visions, viz. in chaps. vii. and xii, and is also mentioned chap. ii; and since especially in the 7th chap. one is seen in the vision "like the Son of Man," to whom the kingdom is given, then most naturally does chap. ix, which speaks of the "anointed prince," refer to him; and there is no other one in all the prophecies of Daniel that answers adequately to this appellation but he who in that first vision receives the kingdom

from the Most High. Moreover, we have seen that on a comparison of chap. viii. with chap. xi, both those chapters, in the description of the desecration of the temple, refer to the act of one and the same individual. But the description in chap. ix. is not parallel to those two, for one *destroys*, the other *confirms* the covenant; in chaps. viii. and xi, the people of God are the chief object of indignation; in chap. ix. it is the city; in chap. viii. and xi, the abomination of desolation (*singular*) is put where the daily sacrifice had been offered; in chap. ix, the abominations of desolation (*plural*) are put on or against the wing of the temple. And our Savior, as if to teach his disciples to discriminate between them, as well as make them feel the necessity of the closest attention in order rightly to understand the prophecy, says, "Whoso readeth let him understand!" But even were these predictions of desolation given in exactly the same language, it is the *context* which must decide to what events they apply, and the context may demand two diverse applications. There is no such law as makes the same words and sentences always mean the same thing wherever they are found. Here in chap. ix. the context does not allow the application to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes without assuming again and again things for which there is no support in the Scriptures, and without introducing such confusion and disproportion in reckoning the 70 weeks as must destroy all respect for the good sense, not to insist on the inspiration of the writer.

The true view would seem to be not that chap. ix. is given to run parallel with the other three visions as far as Antiochus Epiphanes, while two of those three visions look *beyond* that period, but that it is A SUPPLEMENT TO CHAP. VIII. Chap. vii. predicts the reign of the Messiah; chap. ii. (which is as truly a vision of Daniel as the other four in the mode in which the dream of the king of Babylon was communicated to him) predicts the same reign; chap. xii, which is a continuation of chap. xi, predicts the same reign, but chap. viii. omits it.

Why may not this then most naturally be the *supplement* to chap. viii, and thus be parallel with the others, only more explicit to a wonderful degree?

It is possible that some may not feel entire certainty in respect to the interpretation that has been given of the 70 weeks, or the 69 weeks as extending precisely down to the baptism of Jesus, and his first setting forth on his great work —an event which answers to the prediction in Daniel, and which is moreover described so remarkably by an apostle— "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power," Acts 10: 38. That there were 490 years, as exactly as duration is generally spoken of in the Scriptures, though not necessarily to the precise day, or hour, there has been presented, it is hoped, sufficient ground for believing. But even if at this remote day, and in the confusion and discrepancy of all data given by chronologists, we cannot come with absolute certainty to the exact year of the completion of the 69 or 70 weeks of years, there is as much certainty, nevertheless, for that date, as for any date up to the death of Christ. And we need not the assurance of absolute demonstration, but only grounds for believing that at or near the expiration of the 69 weeks of years, the Prince of Peace was anointed for his great work; that at or near the expiration of 490 years, calculated as men reckon time, the gospel was established, and the most holy reign of the kingdom of heaven through Christ Jesus set up and spread far and wide, and shortly after was Jerusalem made desolate.

For such events about the time of our Lord, were multitudes looking. Where but from these prophecies of Daniel, the prophecy of the 70 weeks and the prophecy of the regular succession of four great kingdoms, known to have taken place in the order predicted; where but from these could the idea have been derived which took so deep hold of the Jews, and as we learn from even heathen historians prevailed throughout the East about the time of the birth of Jesus of the virgin

Mary, that a king should then arise out of Judea and attain to universal empire? Where but from these prophecies of Daniel could the impression have been obtained among the true Israelites respecting one for whom they waited as their *Messiah?* Does any one but Daniel give *the direct clew to the time?* And although the prophecy in chap. ix. is not found in the New Testament applied to events taking place about the time of Christ except by our Lord himself, and is not applied by the apostles themselves to Christ in the writings they have left, yet who can doubt that they so applied it in their teachings? In no direct and formal manner is even the prophecy of the kingdom of heaven in chap. ii, and that in chap. vii, appealed to in the New Testament; but who doubts that the New Testament writers alluded to those very prophecies in the use of the phrases "kingdom of heaven" and "kingdom of God?" And who can doubt that this prophecy of Daniel is also equally implied, though not formally mentioned, in those places of the New Testament where "the Messiah," "the Christ," and "the kingdom of Christ," are spoken of? Jesus was therefore the Christ of Daniel. Only to him as the Messiah did this prophecy point, and with it concurred the voice of the true "people the saints." It was he concerning whom the woman of Samaria had learned, using the very same indefinite form of the word employed in Dan. 9: 25, 26, "I know that *Messias* cometh, (which is called Christ,) when he is come he will tell us all things." It was he of whom Andrew spake to Nathaniel, "We have found the Messias." It was he to whom Martha confessed, "Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world." It was he on whose CROSS was written in three languages which were a fit symbol of the many to be "redeemed by his blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," "JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS." It was he of whom his apostles preached, after his death and resurrection, "Him

hath God exalted with his right hand to be a PRINCE and a SAVIOR, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins," and "the propitiation not for" the Jews' "sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world." It was he, in fine, who "though he bear record of himself, yet was his record true," and to the humble Samaritan woman's remark, "I know that Messias cometh," answered, "I THAT SPEAK UNTO THEE AM HE."*

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SECTION VI.

INTERPRETATION OF CHAPTER XII.

CONCLUSION.

This chapter continues the vision in chaps. x, xi, and closes the series of the visions of the prophet. It has been reserved for this place because it was judged to need the collected light of the others, at least for the full understanding of some parts of it, (See Interpr. p. 63.) For while the vision, as all acknowledge, is the expansion of those which precede it, it yet has this peculiarity—that it only touches briefly what has before been enlarged upon, and enlarges to a great extent on what the others had touched but briefly. The reader, with an eye that has looked over the wide field of the prophet's visions, will now place himself at the point of view, (11: 40—45, Interpr. pp. 57—62,) where the interpretation of the vision recorded in chaps. x, xi, xii, was suspended.

1 And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation *even* to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

* John 4: 25, 26. 1: 41. 11: 27. 19: 19. Acts 5: 31. 1 John 2: 2.

Michael the great prince, is the same person mentioned in the introduction of the vision, as "Michael one of the chief princes," and "Michael your prince," 10: 13, 21. It was Michael the tutelar angel to the Jewish nation, (Interpr. p. 14, Comp. Jude v. 9.) His standing up, denotes the aid which was to be extended to the prophet's countrymen from on high. And the Bible affords ground for believing, that the aid of angels as ministering spirits is actually extended to men, Comp. Ps. 103: 20. Heb. 1: 14. Luke 1: 19. 22: 43.

The time of trouble was the period of persecution and struggle, which commenced in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, particularly at the time of his last expedition into Egypt, 11: 40—45, comp. with 11: 30—34.

Up to the commencement of that period, from the time of the complete restoration of Jerusalem after the Captivity, the Jews, though tributary to foreign monarchs, were permitted to live under the immediate government of individuals chosen from among themselves, and they enjoyed a tranquillity but seldom interrupted. Wars raged around them, but the flames did not kindle on them; their land was entirely exempt down to the times of Antiochus the Great, 198 B. C. In transferring their allegiance to him from the king of Egypt, they took a heavy burden, and involved themselves in serious consequences, See on 11: 14, 16, 20. And in the desecration of their temple by his son Antiochus Epiphanes, and in the persecutions immediately ensuing, arose their saddest calamities. Not even by their Assyrian conqueror, who carried the nation into captivity for seventy years, were they treated with such barbarity; nor was their temple so polluted, and such compulsory measures employed to make them abandon the religion of their country, and adopt paganism. It was a time of trouble, which, so long as it lasted, had not a parallel in the history of nations.

On the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, Antiochus Eupator his son, a youth of only nine years of age, succeeded to the

Syrian throne; and shortly afterward, another and successful claimant appeared, Demetrius, whom his father Seleucus Philopator, the predecessor of Antiochus Epiphanes, placed at Rome as hostage instead of Antiochus recalled, See on 11: 21. Two armies were sent by the young king, and two by Demetrius, against Judas, in quick succession, until his band, then numbering but 3000, exhausted and discouraged, began to fall off to their homes, and only 800 remained with him against the advancing army of 20,000, the strongest and best disciplined of the forces of Syria. Judas was earnestly advised to retreat, and return with recruited and more numerous forces. But he replied, "God forbid that I should do this thing, and flee away from them; if our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our honor." The enemy came on. Judas and his few men fell impetuously on the right wing, where the strength of the army was, and routed it. But he was enclosed by the left wing, and finally fell, overpowered by numbers, after long resistance and terrible slaughter on both sides, 161 B. C. "The remnant" of his band "fled." He deserved the eulogy uttered on the occasion of his death, "How is the valiant man fallen, that delivered Israel!" 1 Macc. chap ix. "He left behind him a glorious memorial by gaining freedom for his nation," (Josephus Antiq. XII. chap. xi.)

On the death of Judas, their enemies came forward more boldly, and distressed the Jews on every side. The friends and associates of Judas were sought out by apostate Jews, and delivered up to a miserable death. And it is remarked both by Josephus and the historian of the Maccabees, that the calamities of the times, with famine added, were greater than they had experienced since their return out of Babylon, and the nation seemed again on the verge of ruin, Antiq. xiii. c. 1, 1 Macc. 9: 27.

The place of Judas was however supplied by Jonathan, who, though compelled to flee to the thickets on the banks of

the Jordan, yet so followed up the victories of his brother, and so harrassed the Syrian army, that Demetrius was glad, in about a year from the death of Judas, to grant a truce to the Jews. It continued about two years, when it was interrupted for a season, but again renewed. Meantime there appeared, 153 B. C. another claimant for the Syrian throne, Alexander Balas, supported by the Romans, and after four years he obtained it. Both Demetrius and Alexander courted Jonathan's favor. From the former he received the appointment of king's general in Judea, with authority to raise forces, to repair Jerusalem, to receive back hostages that had been required, and rebuild the wall around the mountain of the temple, which Antiochus Eupator, in violation of his treaty at the raising of the siege of Jerusalem, had commanded to be pulled down. From Alexander he received the commission of high priest, with a purple robe and crown of gold, worn only by princes. He immediately entered on the duties of his several commissions; and his growing power was fast rallying his nation, and disbanding all the Syrian garrisons, and expelling the wicked, when he was treacherously murdered between the contending Syrian factions, B. C. 144. To him succeeded his brother Simon, with the dignity of prince and high priest, under whom the Jews, delivered from the Syrian yoke, and no more compelled to pay tribute, became once more an independent nation, 143 B. C.

Here then would seem to be a fulfilment, at least in part, of the promise of deliverance given in 12: 1. The prophet's people were delivered from a subjection to foreign power, which, commencing with the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in the year 606 B. C., and interrupted by only two short intervals of unsuccessful revolt from him, had continued through a period of 463 years. It was a deliverance effected for every one found written in the book, i. e. every faithful one for whom it was surely purposed; (Comp. "scripture of truth," Interpr. p. 15;) every one who should not perish

in those struggles; every faithful one who, having fallen into divers trials, and been spared through them, should be made white by them, 11: 35. Compare also the language in Is. 4: 3, "And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem." Also Exod. 32: 32, 33—"Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sin: and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book."

But notwithstanding all this, did such a deliverance then take place, that the true Israelite would not look for something further still, as its higher and not remote consummation? would not even the language "little help," 11: 34, applied to the deliverance begun by Mattathias and his sons, lead to the expectation of something more? Only 40 years passed away, and civil commotions began to arise, which in the reign of Alexander Janneus cost the lives of more than 50,000 of the Jews. On the death of Alexander, and afterwards of his queen, the succession was disputed between her sons Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, until finally the Roman general Pompey then in the neighborhood, was introduced as umpire. His decision, which was in favor of the weaker Hyrcanus against Aristobulus, not being complied with by the latter, Pompey proceeded to enforce it, attacked Aristobulus who had possession of the city, and at last subdued it, with great slaughter of the Jews. Judea once more became a province, B. C. 63, and lost its new freedom; nor from that day to the present has she regained it. Was the deliverance, then, which was effected under Judas Maccabeus and his brethren, the adequate and entire fulfilment of this prophecy? Was it to this alone that the "long warfare" led the way? Having gone through this long series of prophetic events, was the end a temporal prosperity of only 40 years, and an independence of only 80 years? It certainly admits an applica-

tion to the higher deliverance by our Lord Jesus Christ, going forth under the protection of "an angel strengthening him," (Luke 22: 43) in the new reign, the new kingdom of heaven, of which he is the head.

The phrase "at that time," in the first clause fixes the *commencement* of the period of struggle for freedom toward the close of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, (11: 40—45, Interpr. pp. 57—62). Michael should then take his stand for the Jews, should then arise and gird himself for their aid. But how long the struggle should continue, is not told.

The phrase "at that time," in the last clause looks back to "the time of trouble" in the middle clause. At that *period* of trouble, continue as long as it might, (and we have seen that it continued beyond the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that it was at least 25 years from the standing up of Michael before the prophecy could have had its accomplishment in its application even to the complete temporal deliverance of the Jews,) at that period of trouble, continue as long as it might, the kingdom of David, so long and so often promised, should be set up, the Son of David come, of whom it could be so truly said, "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," John 8: 36. And so it was. This was the great closing scene of trouble before Christianity, the reign of the Son of God, was established. The prophet, looking from a point of time so far back as 534 B. C., down to within 160 years of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,—a period which should be a time of trouble with only a few intervals of quiet,—could with propriety contemplate the salvation effected by Christ, as coming "at that time." It did come during that period—a period ending with such tribulation to the Jews as a greater than Daniel not only affirmed "was not since the beginning of the world to this time," but added," no, nor ever shall be."

In the application of 12: 1, both to the deliverance under the sons of Mattathias and to the higher spiritual redemption

accomplished by Christ, the prediction has been regarded not as predicting primarily an event, which event is *typical* of another, (See Interpr. p. 86,) but as a *general* prediction which, as *genus* includes several *species*, may include more than one event, but in its application must however be determined by the context and circumstances of the case. Should such an interpretation be deemed inadmissible here by any, then that would seem to be preferred which passes entirely over this period of temporal struggle and deliverance, and fixes solely on the reign of the Messiah. The phrase "at that time," may signify *when that time shall be ended,* (for the authority so to render it, see on the phrase "in the days of these kings," Interpr. 154, 155,) and denote that the kingdom of the Messiah should come at no remote period after the times of this persecuting king; that it should follow as the next great event after the overthrow of the Syrian power, See on chaps. ii, vii. The transition from Antiochus to Christ here at the close, has its parallel in the transition at the opening of the vision, 11: 3, 4, from Xerxes to Alexander—a period of 134 years. It has its parallel in the transition in other prophets from predictions of the captivity to that of the reign of Christ, Is. chaps. vii.—ix. It has its parallel in the other visions of Daniel in the transition from the end of the Syrian kingdom to the establishment of the fifth kingdom; for from Antiochus Epiphanes the dominion of Syria over Palestine virtually ceased. The deliverance effected by our Lord Jesus Christ was not indeed from earthly trials. But Daniel, in accordance with the general mode of the prophets, and, as we have seen in the other visions, with his own, describes the spiritual deliverance under the symbols of an earthly and temporal.

It confirms the application of this verse to Christ, that, as once and again remarked, these visions of Daniel relate to one and the same great train of events; and that this last, in chapters xi, xii, the larger and fuller development of them,

must substantially contain them all. We look back to the chapters preceding, and see that mention is made of a kingdom which the God of heaven should set up, and which should last forever. Certainly that kingdom would not be omitted in this closing and more expanded vision. And accordingly we find, here at the close of the vision in the place where it should be found, a general prediction which may be applied and is properly applied to that same kingdom; a prediction of deliverance harmonizing perfectly with that in chap. vii, where judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom; a prediction which is fully realized only in Jesus as indeed "he who should have redeemed Israel," Luke 24: 21. The remarks of Rosenmüller on this verse, who yet finds not the kingdom of Christ in chap. ix, are that "on the death of Antiochus Epiphanes not a few of the Jews seem to have entertained the hope of the speedy arrival of the happy era concerning which the ancient prophets prophecied, viz. that under a great king of the race of David, there would spring up an altogether new and most flourishing state of things especially for the Jews. Nevertheless Gabriel teaches that it would not immediately follow, but only after great afflictions." Some have referred this deliverance to the Christians who escaped death on the siege of Jerusalem, and fled to Pella, but this is altogether too confined an application, and does not harmonize with the predictions in chaps. ii, vii, and ix. The deliverance, as applied to the times of our Lord Jesus Christ must be the great salvation through faith in his name—"redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," Eph. 1: 7.

2 And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame *and* everlasting contempt.

The fact of a resurrection, both for the just and the unjust,

and an eternal retribution, was, as we have already seen, (Interpr. pp. 49—51,) most distinctly recognized in that "time of trouble" which began in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. It was the great motive which enabled many to suffer the most dreadful tortures rather than disobey God, and depart from his law. Must not this passage teach the doctrine they believed? Was it not one source of their belief, and one great means of its confirmation? Must not the prophet himself have so understood the passage, especially in connection with what the angel said to him in the last verse of this chapter, viz. Thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days. Even if the idea in the first verse should be only that of temporal independence, achieved by the Maccabees, the context, and the exigency of the case, demand here the interpretation which makes the passage affirm the doctrine that though man dies and sleeps in the dust, yet shall he live again.

There is indeed very highly figurative language employed in the Scriptures, to denote the renovation of the mere civil and religious state of the Jews. As in the prophet Ezekiel 37: 12—14, "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land." But here the context, and the mention of their being brought to their own land, leave us in no doubt how to understand it, though the very imagery employed is doubtless taken from the doctrine of man's resurrection from death to a future state. But the passage in Daniel is of a different and higher character. The context and phraseology and known circumstances of the case in Ezekiel, demand a temporal resurrection; in Daniel, they as imperatively demand a spiritual. In chapter xi, the prophet had

spoken of some who should forsake the holy covenant, and of some who should be faithful to it. The faithful should fall both by flame and by sword, and die before any renovation in the condition of their nation, or the coming of their Messiah. The wicked, the apostates from the covenant, they too should die; many of them should be cut off by a violent death in those very times. But this should not be the end. Those who should perish in their struggle to rescue the sanctuary from its desecration, and die manfully for their brethren; those who should choose death by flame or by sword, rather than abandon the true religion and embrace idolatry; those who waited for the promised redemption of Israel, and preferred it above their chief joy, but died without the sight, should not lose their reward, nor fail to share in the blessings of the new reign. They should live again, they should see the Messiah, they should inherit everlasting life. On the other hand, the faithless and reprobate, those who should forsake the holy covenant and sell themselves to wickedness, and sleep in the dust as well as the godly,—they too should live again, they should wake up to shame and everlasting contempt, they "should not escape the hand of the Almighty, neither alive nor dead," 2 Macc. 6: 26. The context therefore, and phraseology, and circumstances of the case, all concur to establish the interpretation not of a temporal but spiritual resurrection; and the doctrine is here mentioned particularly in its application to the many involved in those troublous times.

3 And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever.

This is a further expansion of the thought in v. 2. It is a Hebrew parallelism, and may thus read: They that be wise and turn many to righteousness, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, even as the stars, forever and ever. They

were the godly, such as have already been alluded to; they were those who, like the good Eleazer and others, "left a notable example to such as be young, to die willingly and courageously for the holy laws"—"a memorial of virtue not only unto young men but unto all his nation." The glory mentioned cannot be only the glory of their reputation—the glory in which their *names* should live. True, the names of a very few have shone down, and will still shine, through the ages, as stars; and the firmament, once so dark with clouds over their heads, is bright with the light of their glorious deeds. But the glory mentioned seems something better than earthly reputation; it was the glory they should be awake to enjoy. They should not lie forever trodden down in the dust, but ascend on high to enjoy a glorious condition evermore. So they believed, and believing, teach us how to understand this passage aright.

The doctrine of immortality and future retribution was a a doctrine which our Savior found established among the Jews when he appeared. It was uttered by Martha when she said of her brother Lazarus, "I know that he shall rise again at the resurrection in the last day," (John 11: 24). Our Lord explained and confirmed it more fully than it had ever been taught or believed before—"The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," (John 5: 28, 29). It was re-affirmed again and again by the apostles, and by one of them in imagery like the prophet's, "One star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead," 1 Cor. 15: 41, 42. Does not the declaration in 12: 2, 3 harmonize with these, and teach the same great truth?

In respect to the prophet's association of the resurrection with the deliverance of his people, it is not so associated as to

bind them both together in simultaneous occurrence, as not a few now suppose. Verses 2, 3, contain a truth asserted in general terms. The phrase "at that time," in v. 1, regards the time of the deliverance, not of the resurrection. When the deliverance should come, it should be *followed* by the resurrection; but at how remote a period, the prophecy does not say. The apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, who are the prophets of the New Testament, have fixed the event of the resurrection at the close of the gospel dispensation.

The interpretation of Rosenmüller on verses 2, 3, is the following—"After the deliverance predicted 12: 1, Gabriel teaches that on an appointed day of judgment unto which the dead shall be called back to life, the good should be separated from the wicked: the dead in the dust of the earth shall awake from the sleep of death: some of the dead shall rise to everlasting blessedness, others to everlasting ignominy." "Nor can there be a doubt," adds he, "that the passage relates to the resurrection of the dead to universal judgment, which the Jews were expecting at the advent of their Messiah."

Verses 1—3 of this chapter are made a main pillar by Messrs. Miller, etc., for supporting their doctrine of the second advent of Christ, A. D. 1843. They bind the two events of the *deliverance* and the *resurrection* together in one simultaneous crisis, asserting that the deliverance has not yet come. But certainly nothing is more common than for the sacred writers to unite two events together which yet are wide apart. We have seen it in this very vision, on 11: 2, 3, where Xerxes and Alexander are placed in juxta-position, when yet they were 120 years apart. We have seen it in 9: 26, where the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem is given in immediate connexion with that of the cutting off of the Messiah, when yet the one took place 40 years earlier than the other. The same occurs, as already noticed, in Isaiah chaps. 7—9: 7, where the events are more than 600

years asunder. The deliverance, however, here recorded by the prophet, has already come, it is the great salvation already in the world, which came "TO THE JEW FIRST," Rom. 1: 16. If the *resurrection* is to take place only with the events predicted v. 1, then there is no resurrection for such as have fallen asleep in Jesus since he came into the world; and those who bind the two events together in close proximity virtually take sides with the Sadducean members of the church at Corinth, and involve the prophets, as those members did the apostles, in the implication of being false witnesses of God, 1 Cor. 15: 15.

The arguments by which their doctrine is derived from vs. 1—3, are, as we have seen in part on 11: 20, 21, 30, 31, 36, (Interpr. pp. 29, 30, 42—44, 54,) utterly without a basis in the meaning of the prophecy. From 11: 40 they proceed as follows: The king pushed at is Bonaparte; the king of the south designates the three kings of Sardinia, Italy and Spain, allied against Bonaparte; the king of the north coming against him like a whirlwind, is the king of Great Britain; the glorious land is Italy; the tidings out of the east and north which troubled him was the "holy alliance" of kings on the north and east of France; his going forth with great fury to destroy, was the famous Russian campaign; his planting his tabernacle in the glorious holy mountain was his being crowned at Milan in Italy; Michael's standing up means the revivals in this country in 1815—1818; the time of trouble is yet in futurity, which was first assigned to A. D. 1839, then changed to A. D. 1840.* Can such exposi-

* Miller's Lectures, pp. 105—109, 300. Mr. Litch, another preacher of the doctrine, differs from Mr. Miller somewhat in his interpretation of the verses above mentioned. The king pushed at is still Bonaparte; the king of the south is the Turkish power in Egypt; the king of the north is the same Turkish power in Syria; the glorious land is Palestine; tidings out of the east and north were the total failure of Bonaparte's East India expedition, and a file of newspa-

tions as these need a formal refutation? It is needed for some, but a brief notice will suffice. Let the reader see that in respect to the place from which north and south are calculated, such writers *have arbitrarily shifted the ground from Palestine to France;* that they make verse 40 mean *three* kings together, when it speaks of *one*, viz. the king of the south, and they introduce another person against whom the king of the south pushes, when it is the same king of the north; that they give to *the city Milan in Italy*, the appellation of *glorious holy mountain*—an appellation given in the Bible *to Mount Zion alone;* that they are compelled to find some such designation, *because Bonaparte was never in Jerusalem;* that the application of the period of trouble first to A. D. 1839 and then changed to A. D. 1840, *has fallen to the ground*, thereby furnishing premonition that their other applications of the prophecy will prove equally vain and false. Let it be considered too that these writers apply the phrase "children of thy people" to denote *Christians* and all true saints alive at this present day, while they apply the phrase "thy people" 9: 24 also 11: 14, *to the Jews only*, as indeed they must; that having applied it in chap. ix. to the Jews only, yet in the very next vision in chaps. x, xi, xii, where the

---

pers sent from Sir Sidney Smith giving him an account of the disastrous state of French affairs on the continent of Europe; his planting the tabernacles of his palaces between the seas in the glorious holy mountain, means his sojourning transiently in every kingdom between the seas with which Europe is surrounded; as to the events predicted in 12: 1—3, none of them have yet taken place—*Address to the Clergy*, pp. 98—104. Between Mr. Miller's and Mr. Litch's interpretation there is but little choice. One feels no disposition to ridicule on such a subject as this. And yet the words of an ancient writer very readily occur as in point—"If a painter should have a mind to join the neck of a horse to a human head, and taking the limbs from all sorts of animals stick on them all varieties of feathers, and then make it upward a beautiful woman but downward a loathsome fish, could you help laughing at such a sight?"

angel comes to tell Daniel what should befall *his people*—his countrymen—in the latter days, they turn aside the prophecy from those for whom it was intended and talk about the Pope, and Bonaparte, and holy alliance, and what not, with no sort of reference to the fortunes of the Jewish nation, or rather with putting them entirely out of the question. But what extravagant and absurd interpretation may not be expected from such as confound the sanctuary of God with the city Rome, or with Paganism's sanctuary, (when Paganism had none, for the Pagan temples had been abolished,) and the continual burnt-offering with the abolition of Pagan sacrifices, and protract the date of this last event more than 100 years from the period assigned in all history? These persons come down "to the end" in by-paths of their own which have led them utterly out of the way. They have turned aside from "the Scripture of truth" to fables. They have followed not the pure light of prophecy, but an ignis-fatuus kindled out of the vapors of their own minds.

4 But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, *even* to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

To "seal the book" is the continuation of the act expressed in the phrase to "shut up the words," and both mean not so much to bring the record of the vision to a close, as a symbolic action to denote that the vision would not be understood for the present, and was to be reserved for future use at "the time of the end," 11: 40—45; the period of trial beginning under Antiochus Epiphanes, and issuing in deliverance; the end of the former things of the Mosaic dispensation, and the establishment of the kingdom of heaven.

"Many shall run to and fro," is literally *many shall run through* [it, viz. the vision] i. e. many *shall eagerly peruse the vision*, diligently investigate its meaning, and thus the knowledge of its aim and purport should be increased, until

it should be fully understood at the needed time.* This last clause confirms the interpretation above given to the phrase "seal the book." Doubtless the wise and the godly read this prophecy in those times that tried their souls, and they were instructed, comforted, and strengthened by it. Doubtless also with all the visions that Daniel saw and recorded, at different times, it helped create that "waiting for the consolation of Israel," which was manifested by the "just and devout Simeon," to whom it "was revealed by the Holy Ghost that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ. And he came by the Spirit into the temple, and he took the child Jesus in his arms, and said, Lord, now lettest thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." There was also "Anna a prophetess, and she coming in, that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem," Luke 2: 25—38.

5 Then I Daniel looked, and behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river.

The river was the Hiddekel, or Tigris, where Daniel was, when he saw the vision, 10: 4. The "other two" persons whom he beheld, were two angels besides the one that had been talking with him.

6 And *one* said to the man clothed in linen, which *was* upon the waters of the river, How long *shall it be to* the end of these wonders?

"The man clothed in linen," was the angel who first appeared in the vision, and made the revelations to Daniel, Comp. 7: 16 and 8: 13. The question is literally, ***Unto how***

* Mr. Wm. Miller explains this as denoting that "*the means of travel will be greatly increased*," by railroads, steamboats, etc.

long an end of the wonders? The demonstrative adjective pronoun "*these*" is the definite article in the original. To what "wonders" then, does the question relate? In 11: 27, 36, 40, 45, the angel had used the language, "yet the end shall be at the time appointed;" "he shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished;" "at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him;" "he shall come to his end, and none shall help him"—language spoken in connexion with king Antiochus Epiphanes. The word translated "wonders" is substantially the same with that translated "marvellous things" in verse 36,—the only difference being, that the latter is a participial, and the former a noun, while both are derived directly from the same verb; and those "marvellous things" are not only spoken of the acts of Antiochus Epiphanes against the religious institutions of the Jews, but are also found in connexion with he "shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished." All this shows the question to aim beyond a reasonable doubt, to the end of the atrocious deeds of the Syrian king against the prophet's countrymen. Of this we shall have more confirmation in the verses following.

7 And I heard the man clothed in linen, which *was* upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth forever, that *it shall be* for a time, times, and a half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these *things* shall be finished.

The position of the angel while making the revelations to Daniel, seems from this verse to have been on the waters of the river, probably mid-way between the banks, on one of which the prophet stood.

The word translated "power," is *hand* in the original. This signification of *power* the word often has. But it also means, and is sometimes translated, *portion*, or *part*, as in

2 Kings 2: 7. It is also found in the plural form, in Dan. 1: 21, where it is translated "times," "ten *times* better," or ten *parts* better. It may therefore signify *portion* in 12: 7. For the appellation "holy people," compare the expression "upright ones" 11: 17, also 12: 1. 9: 24, etc.

The clause "and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people," is literally, *and at the accomplishment of the dispersion of a portion*, [or "the power"] *of the holy people.* In this clause, the angel uses the phrase, "accomplishment of the dispersion of a portion of the holy people," as synonymous with the phrase "end of the wonders."

The question being, How long to the end of the wonders? How long to the end of the dispersion of a portion of the holy people, or the end of the season during which they were wholly without civil or ecclesiastical power? the answer is given of *a time, times and a half*—the same period found in 7: 25, and there shown to be equivalent to three years and a half. It would be unnecessary to say more in illustration of this phrase, were it not that one authority was unintentionally passed over, on which much stress has been laid. It is found in Leviticus, chap. 26, where God threatens to punish his children *seven times* for their sins—which in a prophetic sense it is said makes 2520 years, and commencing with the captivity of Israel under Esarhaddon 677 years B. C. runs out in A. D. 1843.* Now those declarations in Leviticus read thus—"If ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins." And still after, "If ye walk contrary to me, I will bring seven times more plagues upon you." And still after, "If ye will not be reformed by me by these things, I will punish you yet seven times for your sins." And yet once more, "If ye will not for all this hearken unto me, I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your

* Millers Lectures, pp. 261, 2. Cox's Letters, p. 66.

sins," vs. 18, 21, 24, 28. Now how can one fail to see, that just so many *probations* are here given; that if at the close of one period of probation they were impenitent and unsubdued, they should be punished yet more, and so on? If the *seven times* mean 2520 years, then they must be multiplied *four* times, which will make *ten thousand and eighty years* —rather too many for those who make the world end A. D. 1843. This passage therefore affords not the least countenance to the method of the double transmutation of the times into days, and then days into years; and when one looks at the scope of the chapter, it seems strange that it should ever have been quoted for such a purpose, and that such an interpretation of it should be widely adopted. It only seems not quite so strange as the manner in which, after the "times" are brought down to the present day, the prediction of the scattering of the power of the holy people* is applied to *the divisions of modern Christians into sects or parties*, (Miller's Lectures, p. 113)—an evil that good men may mourn over, but not exactly the thing revealed to Daniel.

In Dan. 12: 7, the context, and known circumstances and facts in the case clearly guide to the desecration by Apollonius, as the event from which the "time, times and a half" are reckoned. From that period was the city "strange to those that were born in her; and her own children left her," 1 Macc. 1: 38. And it was not until Judas said, 'Let us go up to cleanse and dedicate the sanctuary,' and thereupon "all the host assembled themselves together and went up into mount Sion," (1 Macc. 4: 36, 37,) that the dispersion began to be ended.

"And when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these *things* shall be finished." As the word "things" is not in the original, to what does the

* Mr. Litch, not much less out of the way, considers this fulfilled in the "*spreading*" *of Christians to preach the gospel*, i. e. in modern missions at home and abroad! p. 108.

demonstrative pronoun "these" relate? Is the word "wonders" to be supplied from verse 6? If so, then the idea is, that when the prophet's people should be able to come once more into the city after their dispersion, then should commence the epoch of their deliverance from the power of the persecutor, to end with the higher redemption through Jesus Christ. And we have seen it was so. The holy people were exiles from their city from the desolation by Apollonius till they went again, 3½ years after that desolation, to purify and hallow their sanctuary. The purification of the sanctuary marks an epoch of signal deliverance. Their daily sacrifice was not again taken away, their religious services not again suspended, until indeed, after continuing more than 200 years, the temple worship was again taken away in the final desolation of their city by the Romans. The holy people went on from conquering to conquer, until their independence was once more achieved, and the still greater Deliverer at last came.

But the phrase is not like "they all," or "all of them;" which would most naturally have been employed, had the angel meant to say, *all of the wonders*. The course of the prophecy seems here to be this—How long shall it be to the end of the infamous deeds of the persecuting king? The answer is given, Three years and a half. When that season of perplexity, and of treading down God's people, shall have passed away, then what remains of the vision shall haste to its accomplishment; then may the holy people lift up their eyes, and expect "the kingdom of heaven"—a kingdom which shall be soon set up after these persecutions, and which, continuing until all things shall be subdued unto the Father in his own appointed time, shall close with the resurrection of all that are in the graves.

8 And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what *shall be* the end of these *things*.

This question is not like that asked by one of the angels. It pertains not to duration, but to quality and particulars. It is not, How long to the end of the wonders? but, *What the issue of these* [things], What the *after-part* of these things? The word *wonders* is not expressed, and the word translated "end," is not the same with that in verse 6, but the same with that translated "posterity" in 11: 4. Whether the word wonders be supplied, or not, it affects not the general sentiment here contained. The question Daniel asks, has manifest reference to the last clause of verse 7. In respect to the events which should be the accomplishment of the whole series, the revelation by the angel had been given in the most general and summary manner. Daniel understood neither their nature fully, nor the particulars; he understood not the relation of their final issue to the "time, times and a half," during which his countrymen should be dispersed. And a glance at the previous visions will sufficiently show that in respect to those events which should be ushered in by the coming of the Messiah, he had only that measure of knowledge granted to him, which would naturally lead him to desire more. And we have, in this state of Daniel's mind, an illustration of the words of our Lord,—"Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them," Matt. 13: 17. Compare also the words of the apostle Peter 1: 10—12, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophecied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, [Dan. 9: 26,] and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from hea-

ven; which things the angels desire to look into," [Dan. 12: 5, 6, also 8: 13.]

9 And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words *are* closed up and sealed till the time of the end.

No more disclosures were to be made, no further particulars given. "The time of the end," would bring further light, would fully reveal the nature of the events, and disclose them in their particulars, and their final issue. The needed light and grace would be bestowed at the time, and the prophecy though not fully understood now, would yet serve to due preparation of the heart beforehand.

10 Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand: but the wise shall understand.

In those days of trial, when the king should have such indignation against the holy covenant, and against those who would not forsake it, *then the godly should both study these prophecies, and understand them*, and find in them the strongest motives to be faithful to the end. They should not despair of deliverance, should not distrust God's word, and though they should fall by fire, and by sword, and by captivity, and by spoil, their calamities should work together for their good. On the other hand, the apostates from the covenant would still do wickedly; they would neglect God's word, as we know from history they did, in their desire to escape the penalty of death to all with whom might be "found the book of the testament;" (1 Macc. 1: 57;) and they would therefore not understand, nor have before them the great motives to endure unto the end. Moreover, by the light of this series of events, the wise and godly *should be able to trace out the issue in the promised redemption of Israel.* And so, as we have seen, there were those among the prophet's people, who, *in their waiting for the consolation of Israel, were doubtless giv-*

ing heed to the light of these prophecies of Daniel, shining as in a dark place. There were then also the wicked, who, though the Redeemer came to them, comprehended him not. They believed not that Jesus was the Christ, they rejected him, and died in their sins.

11 And from the time *that* the daily *sacrifice* shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, *there shall be* a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

The mode of reckoning time among the Jews was different at different periods. At first, they seem to have followed the Egyptian, (See Gen. chaps. vii, viii,) which gave 365 days to the year, and divided the year into twelve months of thirty days each, except the last, which had thirty-five days. In the times of the Maccabees, and of Josephus, they followed the Grecian mode—twelve months to the year, each month alternately of thirty days and twenty-nine days, which made a year contain 354 days. At the expiration of every three years, they added, after the month Adar, (the last month of their year,) an intercalary month, to make their general time correspond with the Roman. Regarding the days as literal days, (See Interpr. p. 81—86,) and computing them by this latter method as most appropriate because they concerned the Jews when they reckoned time in this manner, we have three years, six months, and about fifteen or twenty days, which are the equivalent to time, times and a half—only the angel here gives the *exact* number of the days, the *precise* duration of the desecration.* Even on the supposition, that only 360 days to the year† are meant, it would make but three years and seven

* We have seen that Josephus gives this same number, with the slight variation of 1296 for 1290, Interpr. pp. 93, 129.

† This mode of reckoning seems to be pursued in the book of Revelation. By comparing Rev. 12: 6 and 12: 14 we find that *twelve hundred and sixty days* mean the same with *time, times and a half.* In Rev. 11: 2 and 13: 5, the expression forty-two months is found, and

months with which the time, times and a half would correspond according to the usage of Scripture, See Interpr. p. 126—130. This duration, as we have seen, embraces the period of desecration from the act of Apollonius early in June of the year 168 B. C. to the purification by Judas Maccabeus in the month of Dec. 165 B. C. There is an apparent objection to this, that though the daily sacrifice was taken away in June of 168 B. C., "the abomination that maketh desolate" was not "set up" until the December following; and from the setting up of that till the dedication of the sanctuary was but *three years*. The objection admits of two solutions.

The association of these two acts in verse 11, may no more denote that the same term of time is predicated of both, than the association, by one evangelist, of the thieves in the act of reviling our Savior on the Cross, teaches that both reviled him, when, as we are informed in another place, it was the act of only one. The leading event was *the abolition of the daily sacrifice;* and this, though it happened earlier, draws along with it the mention of the other.

(2) We learn from 1 Macc. 4: 57—60, that after the dedication, Judas caused the gates and chambers to be renewed. He also caused the mountain of the sanctuary to be fortified with strong walls and high towers. This last was a necessary work to secure those who went up to worship in the sanctuary from being annoyed, and even slain, by the Syrian garrison stationed in the city over against the temple. Now if we associate the two acts of taking away the daily sacrifice and setting up the abomination of desolation, and consider them

---

in 11: 3 the duration of 1260 days again. The events to which these periods of time relate in the prophet Daniel and in the apostle John, the context plainly shows to be different. But the passages in Revelation afford sufficient *biblical authority* for those who choose to reckon 360 days to the year, though the mode of reckoning time by one sacred writer in one age is not necessarily the same with that adopted by another sacred writer in a different age.

to last just three years, the remaining six or seven months are not more than sufficient time for the entire renewal and defence of the sanctuary, after the event of its dedication.

These terms of time may possibly be different from each other—the first exactly three years and six months, and the second 1290 days; the former extending from the dispersion to the dedication, the latter from the setting up of the abomination of desolation to the building of the wall, and chambers and gates. It will be observed that in the last date of 1290 days, *the events, which are their limit, are not expressed,* but are left to be implied.

12 Blessed *is* he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.

These days are 45 more than the 1290. Reckoning the 1290 days to close with the dedication of the sanctuary in the 148th year of the epoch of the Greeks and the 25th day of the month Casleu, (the *ninth* month of the sacred year, but the *third* of the civil year,) the 45 days would reach into the 11th month Sebat of the same year 148, corresponding with our Februrary 164 B. C. Reckoning the 1290 days to close with the complete renewal of the sanctuary, and to extend between six and seven months beyond the dedication, they reach from the 9th month of the year 148 to the *fifth* month of the 149th year, which corresponds with our August 164 B. C. What event, then, corresponds with the 1335 days? The author of the first book of Maccabees (and so does Josephus) relates that Antiochus died in the 149th year of the epoch of the Greeks; and as they specify the *ninth* month of the year *one hundred forty-eight* as the time when the sanctuary was dedicated, there must have been of course more than 45 days from that period to the death of Antiochus—for they fix Antiochus's death in the year *one hundred and forty-nine,* and from the dedication to 149 were *ninety-four or five* days. If

the 1290 days *close with the dedication*, then the occasion of blessedness could not be the death of Antiochus, i. e. on the admission that the date assigned for his death by Josephus and the first of Maccabees is correct. His death could neither be the epoch of blessedness, nor the point of transition to any yet higher occasion of blessedness. But reckoning the 1290 days to close with the complete renewal of the sanctuary, then as we have seen above, the 1335 days reach to a point in the year 149, which harmonizes perfectly with the date assigned for the death of this persecutor of the holy people.

The article in the Christian Review that has been referred to, fixes these several dates as follows: the 1150, (equivalent to time, times and a half,) to the dedication; the 1290, to Antiochus's death, making 140 more than 1150 and reaching of course into the year 149; 1335, the time when the news of Antiochus's death reached Jerusalem. The chief objection to this seems the difficulty of harmonizing the 1150 days with time, times and a half; for according to the mode in which it is known that the Jews computed time, three years would be at least 1092 days, which would leave *less than two months for the half a time*, and not more than two months and ten days, reckoning 360 days to the year. The author of the Review, along with many, makes the month Casleu coincide with our month *November*—reckoning the beginning of Nisan, the first month of the sacred year, from the new moon of *March;* but Robinson in Calmet says that the month Nisan may be reckoned with greater propriety from the new moon of *April*, which makes Nisan coincide with our *December*.

Antiochus's death was a fit season for congratulation, especially as he was cut off before he could execute his last and bitterest threats. It has its parallel, as a season of congratulation, in the destruction of the Assyrian king, which the prophet Isaiah made an occasion of a song of rejoicing, 14: 7, 8, "The whole earth is at rest, and is quiet, they break forth

into singing. Yea, the fir trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, Since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us."

But the angel may have had in view, and the context seems to show that he did actually have in view, a higher occasion of blessedness than this. If in verse 1, standing at a point 534 B. C., he looked down the ages and saw the kingdom of the Messiah apparently soon approaching after the great crisis of which he had just spoken; if in verse 7, he meant to be understood to assert that the establishment of the kingdom of heaven should be hastened after the "time, times and a half" persecution under the king of the north, then may he here in verse 12, congratulate those godly ones who should be permitted to come to this expiration and final issue of the 1335 days—this "time of the end" corresponding with the prediction "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." It was a meet object for him thus to speak, to induce the true sons of Israel to live in constant expectancy of the event, until the Messiah should indeed come. The benediction thus pronounced was re-affirmed by our Lord himself, in the spirit in which it was first uttered by the angel; for when he said to his disciples, "Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them," he also said, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see," Luke 10: 23. Matt. 13: 17.

The manner in which the dates of this chapter are interpreted by those who compute the days as years, is quite diverse. Dr. Adam Clarke applies the 1290 days to the continuance of Mohammedanism, and as that arose A. D. 612, it will as he thinks come to an end about A. D. 1900. The 1335 days he reckons from the same date, A. D. 612, which reaches down to A. D. 1950, at which time, as he thinks, the fulness of the Gentiles will be brought in, and the Great Sabbath soon after be ushered in with the year 6000 of the crea-

tion of the world, and 2000 from the birth of our Savior. Scott and others place the destruction both of Mohammedanism and Papacy at the end of the 1260 days, occupy the next 30 (1290) with the extermination of every antichristian power, and introduce the Millennium at the close of the 1335. By fixing the rise of the Papacy in A. D. 606, they coincide in general results with those already given from Dr. Adam Clarke.

Mr. Miller and his coadjutors apply the time, times and a half—equivalent to 1260 days—to the continuance of the papal power from the fall of the Ostrogothic kingdom A. D. 538, which they consider one of the three horns subdued by the little horn, thus making A. D. 1798 the epoch of the overthrow of the papal power; and they find what they consider this overthrow in the act of the French General Berthier who entered Rome that year, deposed the Pope, carried him captive to France, and substituted a republican for the papal government. The 1290 days they add to A. D. 508 (the date which they assign to the abolition of the pagan sacrifices, Interpr. pp. 43, 44), and thus make them tally with 1798 again. The 1335 days they put on to the same 508, and make them reach down to A. D. 1843, when the end of all things they say will literally have come.

All these calculations are utterly without the sanction of scriptural usage. The last is only more arbitrary and extravagant. We have seen that this *open-sesame* number 508 cannot be found anywhere in history, but owes its existence to the mere cabalistic authority of those who make so much of it. The next date A. D. 538 makes even less for them; for the Ostrogothic kingdom they admit was conquered by Justinian's army, (the Roman soldiers,) when with their interpretation of the little horn as the Pope, they ought to make the Pope the destroyer of the Ostrogothic kingdom. They avoid this inconsistency only by saying that the expression 7: 8, "before whom there were three of the first horns

plucked up by the roots," means that they were plucked up *before in point of time, or to prepare the way for* the establishment of the little horn;* but the declaration "he shall subdue three kings," 7: 24, decides the point that it was the *little horn* which plucked up the three others. The number 1798 has less plausibility than either 508 or 538. The papal dominion is wider and stronger now than it was then. Says a celebrated English writer, than whom none is a better judge on this subject. "During the eighteenth century the influence of the Church of Rome was constantly on the decline. During the nineteenth century this fallen church has been gradually rising from her depressed state, and re-conquering her old dominion."† She had been weaker before 1798 than at that time, and from that very prostration rose up forthwith in more might. So utterly does Mr. Miller and his associates stumble at noon-day over the plainest facts in the world.

Mr. Miller's mode of solving some of the difficulties which trouble him on the days here specified, is in harmony with what has already been presented. The 2300 days, which Daniel did not at first understand, (chap. viii,) the angel had been sent again to explain to him in chap. ix. But Daniel here says, *I heard, but understood not;* i. e. "he could not tell," Mr. Miller thinks, "whereabouts in his grand number of 2300 days, the end of Papal Rome carried him, he understood not how this time was divided."‡ In other words, he had the whole cloth, but did not know how to cut it. "But in verses 10, 11," Mr. Miller adds, "Daniel had all he could ask for, and now could understand the time and length and part of every division which the angel had given him in his instruction so far as to fill up his vision of 2300 days."§ Let one of Mr. Miller's disciples instruct him; who says, "*It was not for Daniel to know the full meaning, that was reserved for others.*"‖

* Litch, p. 64. † Macauly's Miscellanies, Vol. III. p. 357.
‡ Lectures, p. 102. § Ib. p. 103. ‖ Litch, p. 107.

13 But go thou thy way till the end *be:* for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

Some, as Rosenmüller, suppose the word *end* to refer to the end of the prophet's life, as when the Psalmist, 39: 4, says, "Lord make me to know mine end." But as it has the article, it refers to the end above mentioned, and the sentiment is, Be not anxious to know the times, and seasons, and particulars. Go thou thy way, and wait patiently, and let the end come at the time and manner it may. Thou shalt rest from thy trials, and labors, and arise again from thy sleep in the grave, to have thy portion in the Messiah's reign. When those days shall have ended, then shall shortly come the kingdom of heaven. And though thou shalt die before it arrive, yet because thou hast endured, and by thine own example hast instructed many how to be faithful to God in the midst of temptations and persecutions, thou shalt not fail to be a partaker of the fullest blessings of that future happy reign.*

More than 2000 years have passed since Daniel went to his rest in the grave. The issue respecting which he inquired, has come in part—not in one simultaneous cluster of events, but in such order of occurrence as hath pleased him who seeth the end from the beginning, and with whom a thousand years are as a day. The kingdom of heaven, which the prophet foresaw, is still working deliverance in the world, and the full end is not yet; the resurrection of which Daniel wrote, and which our Savior taught, and Paul preached, has not yet come. It is still before us, it will be still before multitudes when 1843 shall have expired. The question of the *time* of

* This sentiment is given to this last verse both by Gesenius and Rosenmüller. Neither the words nor the context will bear the sense given by some—that of Daniel's standing in his lot as a prophet. Nor are we at liberty to conjecture, in its illustration, that Daniel might have been one of the saints who arose from their graves at the death and resurrection of our Lord, Matt. 27: 52, 53.

its occurrence has nothing to do with our duty to be prepared for it. Let the truly wise and godly go his way, until the end be, not concerning himself with the calculation of the times and seasons, but holding himself in the posture of expectance, as Daniel, and as primitive Christians did, though the objects to which they looked were in reality centuries off. The final issues are unrevealed. To attempt to find them out is to decypher an unwritten record, and against the express admonition of the Great Master, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power," Acts 1: 7. To pretend to know them is to set one's self above not only prophets but apostles. If faithful to God and duty, if one endures temptation, if his love does not grow cold when iniquity aboundeth, if he neglects not God's word, but searches it, and finds in it truth to nourish and confirm his faith and hope, then shall he rest, and his death shall be precious in the sight of the Lord; he shall stand in his lot at the end of the days, and shine as the brightness of the firmament, even as the stars forever and ever. Then too shall he meet all the wise and godly, "who through faith stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, turned to flight the armies of the aliens, were tortured not accepting deliverance, THAT THEY MIGHT OBTAIN A BETTER RESURRECTION. They wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth. These all received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for US, THAT THEY WITHOUT US SHOULD NOT BE MADE PERFECT," Heb. 11: 32—40.

END.

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH DAY AND TO $1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY OVERDUE.

JUL 27 1933

29Feb'60GC

REC'D LD

FEB 29 1960

LD 21-50m-1,'3

e0

YB 27770

25111

BS1556
F6

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY